

THE MONTH

A Catholic Magazine and Review.

MAY, 1894.

CONTENTS.

1. DANTE AND THE "DIVINA COMEDIA." <i>By C. Kegan Paul</i> .	I
2. SONG OF MARY, THE MOTHER OF CHRIST. Containing the Story of His Life and Passion	21
3. ON THE SECONDARY EDUCATION OF CATHOLIC WOMEN	26
4. MODERN WITCHCRAFT AND MODERN SCIENCE. <i>By J.C. Heywood</i>	34
5. CHRIST IN MODERN THEOLOGY. VI. <i>By the Rev. John Rickaby</i>	57
6. CIVIL LIST PENSIONS. <i>By John Jackson</i>	81
7. REMINISCENCES OF SCHOOL LIFE AT FELDKIRCH	98
8. THE ULTIMATE END OF MAN. <i>By the Rev. Charles Blount</i>	105
9. THOUGHTS ON "THE IMITATION OF CHRIST." <i>By Percy Fitzgerald, M.A.</i>	116
10. EARLY ANGLICAN DIVINES ON EPISCOPACY. <i>By Gilbert W. Child, M.D.</i>	131
REVIEWS	134

- I. Outlines of the Law as to the Custody of Children. *By William Cassell Maude, B.C.L., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, and Dudley William Beresford Leathley, Solicitor. With Preface by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster.* 2. The Primitive Church and the See of Peter. *By the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A. With an Introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.* 3. Irish Ideas. *By William O'Brien, M.P.* 4. Idyls and Lyrics of the Ohio Valley. *By John James Piatt.* Little New World Idyls. *By the same.* An Enchanted Castle, and other Poems: Pictures, Portraits, and People, in Ireland. *By Sarah Piatt.*

LITERARY RECORD 145

- I.—Books and Pamphlets.
- II.—Magazines.

LONDON :

OFFICE OF THE MONTH: MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES. DUBLIN: M. H. GILL AND SON.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND CO.

Price Two Shillings.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

**THE GREAT
BLOOD
PURIFIER
AND
RESTORER.**

"FOR THE BLOOD IS THE LIFE"

**CLARKE'S
WORLD-FAMED
BLOOD MIXTURE**

**LARGEST SALE
OF ANY
MEDICINE
IN
THE WORLD.**

The Great Blood Purifier and Restorer. For Cleansing and Clearing the Blood from all impurities, it cannot be too highly recommended.

For Scrofula, Scurvy, Eczema, Skin and Blood Diseases, Pimples and Sores of all kinds, it is a never-failing and permanent cure.

It Cures Old Sores.
Cures Sores on the Neck.
Cures Sore Legs.
Cures Pimples on the Face.
Cures Scurvy.
Cures Eczema.

It Cures Ulcers.
Cures Blood and Skin Diseases.
Cures Glandular Swellings.
Clears the Blood from all impure matter,
From whatever cause arising.

It is the only real specific for Gout and Rheumatic Pains. It removes the cause from the blood and bones.

As this mixture is pleasant to the taste, and warranted free from anything injurious to the most delicate constitution of either sex, from infancy to old age, the Proprietors solicit sufferers to give it a trial to test its value.

Important Advice to all.—Cleanse the vitiated blood whenever you find its impurities bursting through the skin in pimples, eruptions, and sores; cleanse it when you find it obstructed and sluggish in the veins; cleanse it when it is foul—your feelings will tell you when. Keep your blood pure, and the health of the system will follow.

Sold in Bottles 2s. 9d. each, and in cases containing Six times the quantity, 11s., sufficient to effect a permanent cure in the great majority of long-standing cases. BY ALL CHEMISTS AND PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS throughout the world, or sent to any address on receipt of 33 or 132 stamps by the Proprietors, THE LINCOLN & MIDLAND COUNTIES' DRUG COMPANY, LINCOLN.

TRADE MARK, "BLOOD MIXTURE."

Ask for CLARKE'S World-Famed BLOOD MIXTURE, and do not be persuaded to take an imitation.

THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT

These excellent FAMILY MEDICINES are invaluable in the treatment of all ailments incidental to every HOUSEHOLD. The PILLS PURIFY, REGULATE, and STRENGTHEN the whole system, while the OINTMENT is unequalled for the cure of Bad Legs, Bad Breasts, Old Wounds, Sores and Ulcers. Possessed of these REMEDIES, every Mother has at once the means of curing most complaints to which herself or Family is liable.

N.B.—Advice Gratis at 78, New Oxford Street, late 533, Oxford Street, London, daily between the hours of 11 and 4, or by letter.

Works by Father Humphrey, S.J.

- The One Mediator. New Edition, in the press. 5s.
The Sacred Scriptures, or the Written Word of God. In the press.
The Vicar of Christ. 12mo. 2s. 6d.
Christian Marriage. Cloth, 1s.; sewed, 6d.
The Bible and Belief. Cheap Edition, 1s.; sewed, 6d.
Dishonest Controversy. 3d.
The Divine Teacher. A Letter to a Friend. With a Preface in reply to No. 3 of the English Church Defence Tracts, entitled *Papal Infallibility*. Fifth Edition. Cloth, 2s. 6d. Cheap edition, wrapper, 1s.
Mary Magnifying God. May Sermons. Sixth Edition. 2s. 6d.
Other Gospels; or, Lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s.
Mr. FitzJames Stephen and Cardinal Bellarmine. 1s.
The Religious State. A Digest of the Doctrine of Suarez, contained in his Treatise, *De Statu Religionis*. Three vols. 8vo, 1,200 pp. £1 10s.

1

e

t
t

e
it

t
O
or
i.

-

ill
E,
ed
ed
st

the

-

d.

ce
pal

ed.
he

on-
ros.



*Dante and the "Divina Commedia."*¹

I HAVE, perhaps too adventurously, undertaken to speak to you this evening on Dante, and his Divine Comedy, and as time is short, and the subject long, will go to the matter without prelude. It is necessary, in the first place, to get certain facts and dates clearly before our minds. Dante was born in Florence in 1265, and he died at Ravenna in 1321. These fifty-six years divide into two parts, one up to 1302, till when from his boyhood he was an honoured citizen of Florence, the other dating from his banishment in that same year.

Banishment may almost be said to have been hereditary in the Alighieri family, to which Dante belonged. His ancestors were Guelfs, and had been repeatedly exiled from Florence. The names of parties are apt to be changed from generation to generation, and it is not quite easy to explain precisely, what at any given time the words Guelph and Ghibelline connoted. But it may be said generally that the quarrel, which took its rise in Germany, about the middle of the twelfth century, between Henry the Proud, Duke of Saxony, of the Bavarian family of Welf, and Conrad of Hohenstauffen, Duke of Swabia and Lord of Weiblingen, gradually extended into Italy, where the Popes espoused the cause of the Guelfs. The contest therefore became a struggle between the temporal and the spiritual powers. But according to the special localities in which these parties found themselves, the general stream of events was broken by a number of cross currents, so that even the very principles signified by the names were confused and intermingled. In Florence the strife was accentuated by becoming a blood feud between two noble families, the Buondelmonti and the Grantruffetti, which we can best understand by remembrance of the Capulets and Montagues in *Romeo and Juliet*, and it was again heightened by a division in the Guelph party, of whom the so-called Neri wished to open their gates to Charles of

¹ A lecture delivered in the Hall of the Sodality of Our Lady, Farm Street.

Valois and the French, while the Bianchi were wholly Italian and patriotic. Dante, who had cast in his lot with the Bianchi, and was exiled when he had gone on an embassy to Rome to protest against French interference, found himself, a Guelph in name and feeling, on the Ghibelline side. The phenomenon is too well known in modern politics to cause surprise, when the different threads of opinion and passion are disentangled.

The important events in the former part of his life were, that he lost his father when he was eight years old, and the care of his education devolved on his mother, Bella. When still a mere child, not quite nine, he saw the little maid, hardly more than eight, who was to influence his whole life, and, through his writings, take her place among the fair women who have moved the world. Beatrice Portinari was the daughter of a wealthy Florentine, between whose family and that of Dante was some slight acquaintance. In their childish years they met from time to time; so we understand the words in the *Vita Nuova*: "During my boyish years I frequently went in search of her, and praiseworthy was she and noble in her bearing." This sentence seems certainly to mean more than that he saw her merely at a distance.

When the pair were eighteen they met again, the acquaintance having been interrupted by Dante's absence from Florence, but the intercourse was formal and slight. Shortly afterwards she married a rich Florentine, Simon dei Bardì, and in 1290 she died, aged twenty-four. He himself married three years later Gemma Donati, and there is no reason whatever to suppose the marriage was other than meet and fitting, or that the pair were unsuited. They were separated by his banishment, but that was of necessity, not of choice.

His love for Beatrice was in a higher and more supersensual atmosphere than his domestic life. The troubadours had brought from France the images of mediæval chivalry wherein the homage which knights and minstrels paid to their chosen ladies had often nothing to do with human love or natural ties. When he knew that her earthly love was not for him, his own passed into one that was wholly ideal, such as a devout person may feel for his patron saint, of, I am bound to admit, the other sex. But at that first meeting she became a part of his life, a spiritual influence, in the highest sense of the term, and never, but one, has lady been more honoured in all the roll of time.

In his youth Dante attended the Universities of Padua and

Bologna, and there is more than slight evidence that he visited Paris and Oxford. At Paris he studied under Brunetto Latini, a Florentine refugee, one of the most distinguished scholars of his day, whose *Trésor de toutes choses*, written in French, was reprinted so lately as 1824.

He seems to have been a Tertiary of the Franciscan Order, and nothing is more likely for a man of his devout spirit, while few things are less likely, than that, as has been said, he should have entered the Order proper, and left without taking the vows. It can scarcely be necessary to explain to Catholics that Tertiaries or members of the Third Order, whether of Franciscans, Dominicans, or Servites, are men and women, living in the world "and forming a sort of middle term between the world and the cloister, bound by rule to dress more soberly, fast more strictly, hear Mass more frequently, and practise works of mercy more systematically" than others. These are they of whom Milton speaks magnificently and erroneously, as who

To be sure of Paradise,
Dying, put on the weeds of Dominic
Or in Franciscan think to pass disguised,

who really die as they have lived, having already put on as much of the habit as they could, at least the scapular and the belt or cord, and, when human respect need no more be considered, wearing that outwardly which in desire and intent they have always worn. He says of himself:

I had a cord that braced my girdle round.¹

The Franciscans of Ravenna claimed his body, and his name is entered in the roll of their dead.

Leonardo Aretino, Dante's biographer, by no means to be confused with Pietro Aretino, of evil repute and of a later date, describes him as "not wealthy, nor poor. He had a moderate patrimony, enough to maintain him comfortably. He himself was a noble person, graceful and dignified, and of an agreeable countenance. And although he was a scholar, he did not therefore withdraw himself from the world, but associated freely with other young men, and excelled in all their exercises. And it was wonderful how, though he was always studying, yet he never seemed to do so, but lived pleasantly with his companions."

But a student's life alone was not his. In 1289, when he was twenty-four, he took part in the campaigns between the

¹ *Hell*, xvi. 106.

Guelfs of Florence on the one side, and the Ghibellines of Arezzo and Pisa on the other. Aretino says again: "Dante, a youth of good report, was exposed to great danger whilst fighting bravely in the first line of horse," at the Battle of Campaldino, and he served in the week's siege and taking of Caprona. Dante speaks evidently from personal recollection, when he makes Buonconti of Montefeltro tell of his fate in the *Purgatorio*. Buonconti speaks,

At Casentino's foot there runs across
A stream called Archiano, he replied,
In Apennine, o'er the hermit's cell, its source.
There when its name has to be laid aside,
I came, as with pierced throat on foot I fled
And on the plain my track with blood I dyed.
Here my sight failed, and the last words I said
Ended with Mary's name, and here I fell,
And left nought of me but a body dead.¹

He was also "much employed in the service of the Republic," but the details need not delay us, further than to note that at the age of thirty-five he became one of the six Priors annually chosen for the government of Florence, and that during his year of office arose the contest between the Bianchi and Neri, which ended in his exile.

Here it is well we should pause to consider the sharp contrasts, in the middle ages, between the various sides on which life may be viewed, for these must be reconciled and brought into one focus in our minds, if we would understand the character of those ages, of the men who lived their lives in them, and the literature they produced.

We read a chronicle of those days, and the story is full of battle and siege, of rival faction and bloody feud, of statesmen exiled, crimes of horror and of lust which lie on the pages like stains. Or ladies and their knights move through the romances as though there were nothing but love, and often illicit love, to occupy their time and thought, nothing but love and the joy of living, without heed of what might come after. Then we turn to the life of some mediæval saint, the din of battle is hushed, and the laughter dies away, the sounds heard are those of the discipline, the chanting choirs, and the sacring bell, the perfumes are incense, the joy is the stern delight of penance duly done; this world, its strife and its love are naught, and that which is to come is all in all. The age of Dante is that of St. Francis and

¹ *Purg.* v. 90.

St. Dominic, of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, and, in Florence itself, of the Seven Fathers, the Founders of the Servite Order, some of whom Dante must have seen, and of whom the last, St. Alexis Falconieri, did not die till 1310. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are the very heart of the middle ages, they are the centuries of deepest and most unwavering faith, of fervent devotion and terrible crime, of war, wasting lands and cities, of the cloister's unspeakable peace.

How shall we explain and reconcile these things? I turn to one who as a poet ought to have an eye to see and a heart to understand, and ask Charles Kingsley what he has to say of the middle ages, and this is his answer: "The middle age was in the gross a coarse, barbarous, and profligate age. . . . It was in fact the very ferocity and foulness of the time which, by a natural revulsion, called forth at the same time the apostolic holiness and the Manichean asceticism of the mediæval saints. The world was so bad, that to be saints at all they were compelled to go out of the world."

This is surely misleading and inadequate, in view of the fact already stated, that men like Dante did not leave the world, and that a crowd of others, as St. Louis and St. Elizabeth, were Tertiaries.

But on the other hand, there is some truth in what Kingsley again says of men like the late Mr. Kenelm Digby, the author of that beautiful book, too little known in these days, *The Broad Stone of Honour*, the prominent person among the "certain moderns" in the following striking passage:

"A rough and common-life picture of the middle age" is "far from acceptable to those who take their notion of that period principally from such exquisite dreams as the fictions of Fouqué, and of certain moderns, whose graceful minds, like some enchanted well,

In whose calm depths the pure and beautiful
Alone are mirrored,

are, on account of their very sweetness and simplicity, singularly unfitted to convey any likeness of the coarse and stormy middle age. . . . Time enough has been lost in ignorant abuse of that period, and time enough also lately, in blind admiration of it. When shall we learn to see it as it was? The dawning manhood of Europe, rich with all the tenderness, the simplicity, the enthusiasm of youth, but also darkened, alas! with its full share

of youth's precipitance and extravagance, fierce passions, and blind self-will, its virtues and its vice colossal, and for that very reason, always haunted by the twin imp of the colossal, the caricature."

There is, I venture to think, a middle term. Great light no doubt always throws dark shadows, and the shadow of heroic virtue is often heroic vice; but the fighting of that period was not the fighting of to-day. There was none of the wholesale destruction of human life which takes place nowadays:

What time the foeman's line is broke
And all the war is rolled in smoke.

Men went out to the field merrily as to a dance, and they took the chances which, after all, were not seriously against them. Few men, in comparison with those engaged, were killed in mediæval battles.

Of those who went out to Campaldino and Caprona, the great majority returned; the whole of a campaign such as those common in Italy was more like an extended tournament than what we call battles now. Men died sometimes in sport, and they often lived when all was grim and earnest. They held their lives of less account than men hold them now, and they fought, even with the chances of death before them, much as all plucky schoolboys fought in the last generation, not now, because it was part of their life, and it had to be. They feared death less, because they were shrien before a battle or a siege, as before a tournament; and if they died thereafter, our Lady's scapular was on their heart, our Lady's name on their lips. They did not hate their enemies in the way of mortal sin, but only as men of modern politics assail each other in the Commons, and meet perhaps an hour afterwards at the same board, in all kindness and good fellowship. They slew each other if each came in the way of the other's sword, but it was not murder any more, but rather less, than in modern war, it was simply one of the chances of the great and dangerous, but still amusing and joyous game of chivalry, which was to daring souls what Alpine mountaineering is, or has been, in our time. It was a picturesque and beautiful life, to be described in Scott's words:

Sound, sound the clarion, fill the fife,
To all the sensuous world proclaim,
One crowded hour of glorious life
Is worth an age without a name.

Hear what Father Ledoux says of Florence but a short time before Dante's day, and of the seven young men, who, not then in retreat from the world, at our Lady's call lived their life in the warlike, yet prosperous city, faithful though there were heretics, the Cathari, peaceable, as regarded the greater part of its citizens, though no less than six entrenched camps gave evidence of the factions which strove for the mastery :

"Such was Florence with its light and shade, when our seven lads ceased to be mere boys, and were growing into manhood. They were entering that age so full of promise and hope, but big with danger and shipwreck. In that age of abounding life when every faculty is fully developed, when passions are fiercest, and external attractions have greatest sway over the heart, when ambition so easily finds a vent, they were placed in the midst of that great city, where all was in confusion, good and evil jostled each other, and great virtues ran side by side with great vices."

I have made a long digression, but without it, it was impossible to make clear to you my view of the middle ages, and of Dante as a prominent power therein.

His banishment was noted to him at Siena on his way back from Rome. The decree had been in two parts, one dated January 27, 1302, that he and three other leaders of the Bianchi pay a fine of £3,000 and be excluded from all offices of State. On March 10, it was further enacted, that, as the fine had not been paid, if taken they should be burned alive. This was merely formal, intended to ensure perpetual banishment, for as a matter of fact, their houses had been demolished and their property confiscated. Gemma Donati and her children had an adequate competence secured to her as dowry, and she and her children remained in Florence, since her husband could no longer maintain her.

It would take us far too long to trace Dante's wanderings in detail, and a mere catalogue of names and places would only be tedious; enough to quote his own summary from the *Convito*: "Since it pleased the citizens of the fairest and most famous daughter of Rome, Florence, to cast me forth from her most sweet bosom (wherein I was born, and nourished up to the climax of my life, and wherein by their good leave, I long with all my heart to rest my weary soul, and to end the days allotted to me), I have wandered a pilgrim, almost a beggar, through every part where her language is spoken,

displaying against my will the wounds of fortune, which are often wont to be imputed unjustly to the wounded one himself. Truly I have been a vessel without sail and without rudder, borne to divers ports and shores and havens of the dry wind that blows from dolorous poverty, and have appeared vile in the eyes of many, who perhaps through some fame of me, had imagined me in other guise, in whose consideration, not only did I in person suffer abasement, but all my work became of less account, that already done, as well as that yet to do."

At the age of fifty-six he died at Ravenna, having just endeavoured, in vain, to bring about an understanding between Verona and Venice. Boccaccio says: "After he had humbly and devoutly received all the last holy sacraments according to the rites of the Church, and had made his peace with God, he gave back his weary soul to his Creator, on the 14th day of September, being the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, to the great grief of . . . the people of Ravenna." All his earthly troubles ended, he passed, as we may trust, into the presence of Him who is the Supreme Good, to find there the souls whom his vision had already beheld in the eternal light, among them chiefest our Lady, and St. Lucy, with that fair child who had been the guiding star of his life. He was buried by the Franciscans in their Lady Chapel, and there he rests, for Florence claimed in vain the ashes of the great citizen and greater poet, whom she had cast out.

We all probably know by engravings and various reproductions, the two likenesses of Dante, that painted by Giotto in the chapel of the Podestà at Florence, when the poet was thirty, and the bust founded on a cast taken after his death.

In addition to these is the excellent word-portrait by Boccaccio, as follows: "Our poet was of middle stature, and in his advancing years stooped somewhat as he walked. His demeanour was grave and composed, his dress at that time simple and dignified, as became his age. His face was oval, his nose aquiline, his eyes large rather than small, his underlip somewhat projecting; his complexion was dark, his beard and hair thick, black, and curly; his whole aspect was earnest and thoughtful. Now it happened, when the fame of his poem had spread far and wide, that Dante passed before a door in Verona where several women were sitting. One of them whispered softly, but loud enough for him to hear, 'See, this is he who descends into Hell, and comes back again to bring tidings of those who

are down below.' 'Indeed,' answered another, 'thou sayest truly; for dost thou not see how the heat and smoke below have crisped his hair and bronzed his cheeks.' Dante was remarkable for the order and regularity of his life in public and private, no less than for his courtesy and good breeding. At table he was strictly temperate; he always kept within the appointed time, and never exceeded what was needful. Although he appreciated delicate viands, yet he seldom partook of them in preference to his usual simple fare."

I have elsewhere pointed out, what I will venture here to repeat, that Dante's face belongs to a group of four persons, who stand alone within that group, so far as I have noticed. The characteristics of the facial masque and the configuration of the head are much the same in Dante, Savonarola, Cardinal Newman, and George Eliot; and as might be expected, they all have somewhat the same features in their genius also. In each there is the same breadth of brow, the same stern melancholy of expression, softened by rare sweet smiles, in each what Lord Tennyson once called, standing with me before a bust of Dante, "the droop of that awful nose."

Dr. Hettinger, Professor of Theology at Wurtzburg, to whom I am indebted for much that I have said and shall say in this lecture, has summoned up the character of the poet very excellently from his own words of himself in the *Divina Commedia*. You may take them as a summary and sketch, but the full portrait can only come before your mental vision after long years and much study. He says: "In his immortal work the poet has portrayed his own character for all posterity. He is bold, but restrained by duty; proud, but frank and without dissimulation; passionate and implacable in his hatred of evil, but scorning all mean revenge; in his speech, thoughtful, convincing, and truthful. Although he smiles at the follies of mankind, yet he mourns over the sufferings which they entail. He respects all authority, and is full of reverence for the Church. He craves pardon for the boldness of his speech, although its sole aim is the public good. Flattery he abhors, and admires constancy in suffering, even when found among the lost souls. Unwearied in study, he despises riches, and whilst ambitious of fame, is ever ready to acknowledge his faults. Despising the caprices of fortune, he is calm amid adversity. He delights in enlarging his knowledge of men and things, although he values old friends beyond all others.

Everywhere he searches out all that is great and elevated in human nature, and does it homage; he fears nothing so much as the censure of noble minds. He esteems a dignified demeanour in voice, look, and manner. To his native city he clings with an unchangeable affection, which no wrongs can efface; to his friends he is bound by faithful love, to his benefactors by undying gratitude. As a pious Catholic he constantly meditates upon death; he is fervent in prayer, and is devout to the Ever-Blessed Virgin, St. Lucy, and the saints."

We may now pass to the poem itself, which its author called simply "Commedia," but to which the instinct of those to whom it came has added the epithet "divine."

He tells us himself the meaning of the title. "Comedy begins sadly, and ends happily. Hence it is plain why the present work is called a Comedy, for the beginning is dreadful and repulsive as its subject, which is Hell, but the end, which treats of Paradise, is prosperous, desirable and pleasant, and the style employed is simple and homely, being in the vulgar tongue, which even women understand."

The poem is the record of a series of visions vouchsafed to the poet in the other world, and the idea of it was not new. St. Mechtildis, St. Hildegarde, St. Bridget, and others, had written their visions, and in Dante's time scenes from the world to come were favourite subjects of dramatic art. He moved his age so profoundly, because he recognized and used the dominant ideas of his time.

The external design is very symmetrical. Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, have three times three gradations. The three divisions of the poem each contain thirty-three canti, besides the introductory canto. Thus the complete number is one hundred, ten times ten, the number ten signifying completeness.

It is not probable that Dante ever intended his poem to be sung, but no doubt the fact that all ballads had been sung, and that, even in his day, poems were constantly recited with more or less musical inflexion, largely influenced the composition of the poem, when once he had abandoned his first disastrous intention of writing his poem in Latin hexameters. The metre chosen was the triple rhyme, *tersina* or *tersa rima*, eleven-syllabled iambics, in stanzas of three lines, triplets linked by the central line, which always rhymes with the first and third lines of the following stanza. At the end of each canto is a verse (*ritornello*), rhyming with the middle line, added to the last *tersino*.

Such is the form. How is its meaning to be interpreted? Many commentators, as Rossetti, have read into the poem wild and wonderful opinions which could not conceivably have been in the mind of the poet, and have treated the text as Protestants treat the Bible.

Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.¹

But the Church, interpreting the Bible, has recognized in an orderly and scientific manner that it has various senses, and Dante tells us that so too his poem may be interpreted: "It is to be noted," he says in a letter to Can Grande, "that this work has not only one single meaning, but many. For the first meaning is that of the letter, then of things signified by the letter. . . . An example of this mode of treating a subject may be found in those words of the Hundred-and-third Psalm: *In exitu Israel de Ægypto*." By the letter only the going out of the children of Israel in the time of Moses is described, the allegory represents our redemption through Christ. The moral sense signifies the conversion of the soul from the mourning and the misery of sin to the state of grace; and the anagogic sense typifies the passing of the holy soul from the bondage of this corruption to the liberty of everlasting glory.

In the *Convito* he says much the same about interpretation in general, using this curious illustration of the moral sense: that "it is such as we may gather from the Gospel, when Christ went up into the mountain to be transfigured, and of the twelve Apostles took with Him but three, which in the moral sense may be understood thus, that in the most secret things we should have few companions."

This, it will be seen, is quite different from the disorderly interpretations which have forced into the precious texture of the poem the most discordant features of modern thought, and quite accords with Dante's own further words in the *Convito*: "The literal sense should always come first, as that whose meaning includes all the rest."

The subject, then, of the *Commedia*, taken in its literal sense, is the state of souls after death, on which the whole work turns. But considered allegorically the subject is man, and the rewards or punishments he meets with from Divine Justice, according as by his own free acts he deserves well or ill. The literal sense,

¹ This book is that where each may find
A dogma suited to his mind.

therefore, is merely the form in which he embodies the supreme ideas of God's government, the purposes of the world and of man, and the aims of Church and State.

Probably all here, whether they have studied the *Divina Commedia* or not, have a general knowledge of the opening of the poem, which is really the key to the whole. "In the middle way of life" the poet entered a gloomy wood, and arrived at the foot of a mountain whose summit was illumined by the sun. On his beginning the ascent he was driven back by a panther, a lion, and a she-wolf. Then a figure met him, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell, who declared himself to be Virgil, and offered himself as guide through Hell and Purgatory, but a spirit worthier than himself, Beatrice, would lead the poet into Paradise. He had been sent by Beatrice, who told him that St. Lucy had come to her from our Lady, who was moved to pity Dante's case. Thus encouraged, he followed his guide and master along the deep and woody way.

The whole action of the poem occupies ten days. On the night of Holy Thursday, in his thirty-fifth year, March 24, 1301, he enters the wood; on the morning of Good Friday, the day of the Incarnation, he stands before the sunlit mount; on that same evening he enters Hell with Virgil; on the evening of Holy Saturday they reach the Guidecca, or city of Judas, its lowest circle. At half-past one on Easter Day, they stand before the great cavern which leads to the other hemisphere; on Easter Monday, an hour and a half before day, on the other side of Hell, at the foot of the Mount of Purgatory, they again see the stars. From Monday to Friday in Easter Week he traverses Purgatory, on Friday and Saturday the seven heavens, and on Low Sunday ascends to the empyrean.

The general meaning of the whole is in a nutshell, and may be given in Hettinger's words: "Man in the person of Dante is its subject. He is hindered by sin from advancing in the path of virtue, until Divine Wisdom, under the form and name of Beatrice, having taken Reason, Virgil, into her service, goes forth to rescue him. Deeply moved by the penalties of Hell, and its lessons of the hideousness of sin, Dante is purified by contrition and penance, and is at length conducted by Beatrice into the joys of Paradise."

I need hardly say that an analysis or even description of the poem is simply impossible in the time at our disposal. I will say but a few words on each of its parts.

The geography, so to speak, of the next world is singularly interesting, but cannot detain us here; this only may be noted, that neither of the three kingdoms is one and indivisible, the woes and the blessings are alike graduated. Thus, when in Hell, we meet the undecided and the ignorant, unbaptized children, the great souls of the world before Christ, poets as Homer, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan, and Virgil himself; warriors as Hector, Æneas, Cæsar; even such philosophers as Socrates and Plato, human conscience would revolt at considering such in the same state of eternal misery as murderers and tyrants, the violent and the false as Judas, the only soul, as Father Faber said, of whose damnation we are quite sure. It is this want of classification, if I may say so, which runs through the whole Protestant conception of Hell, that has made so many, revolting from it, revolt also against much else which the Church has taught. But Dante was too great a theologian, too loving-hearted a man, to acquiesce in this. There are three only states known to Holy Scripture and to the Church, and in Hell he was bound to place all who are not in Purgatory or Heaven. But *all* in Purgatory, as well as in Heaven, are saved, and will ultimately have the Beatific Vision. The one punishment therefore common to *all* souls in Hell is that they will not attain to the Beatific Vision. Many will only never reach that highest blessedness, but their sole pain will be an unsatisfied longing. As in this life there are many men and women who cannot be called happy in any sense, but yet are doing their duty and living their lives in an acquiescence which is far short of misery, so also even in Hell may be an acquiescence with the supreme and holy will, which cannot be called torment.

What St. Thomas says of infants will probably apply to those also in the heathen world, who have lived up to the light within them. He teaches that these are simply excluded from Heaven, and being free from personal guilt, suffer no pain of sense which is its penalty. "As they are not made capable of possessing the Vision of God, they no more grieve for its loss than a bird does that it is not an emperor or a king. Moreover, though not united to God in glory, they are joined to Him by the share they possess of natural goods, and are able to rejoice in Him by natural knowledge and love."

Then again Dante, in common with St. Thomas Aquinas, distinguishes between sins of human frailty and sins of malice,

and the punishment is very different in each case. For some there are consolations in sorrow, and there is this above all, that if Dante the man pitied lost souls, and if his pity gave them comfort, much more would the pity of the merciful God.

How far the actual images of Hell may have a material meaning we cannot tell, any more than we can say whether the words "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," mean a material worm and a material fire. The only point for consideration is this: "The actual images of the torments are the poet's own work, but the idea of the retributive justice of God, . . . the notion of the punishment varying with the sin, are doctrines intimately and necessarily bound up in the poet's belief in God, and with it they stand or fall." Even Plato said: "They who have been guilty of the worst crimes, and are incurable by reason of their crimes, are made examples, for as they are incurable, the time has passed at which they can receive any benefit to themselves. But others get good when they behold them for ever enduring the most terrible and painful and fearful sufferings as the penalty of their sins; there they are, hanging up as examples in the prison-house of the world below, a spectacle and a warning to the unrighteous men who come hither."¹

The *Inferno* itself as a poem, though terrible in the extreme as a whole, is, as all know, relieved by passages of extraordinary beauty and grace. Perhaps there is no single episode in poetry which has been more often translated, or has been more often the subject of art, than that of Paolo and Francesca, the sinful lovers, whirled for ever through space before the blast of God's displeasure. I am inclined to think that after all Lord Byron's attempt to translate this most untranslatable passage remains the best, and the most true to the form of the original. It is interesting to note this at a day when Byron is little read, and when the main charge brought against him as poet is his formlessness.

But beyond such sustained passages, and they are many, the furnace is cooled ever and anon "as by a moist whistling wind," when we meet with touches from nature so gracious and beautiful as the descriptions of the flocking of the starlings in winter, and of the cranes who

Fly twittering, leaving in the air behind
A lengthened track.

¹ *Gorgias*.

Or of the hoar-frost in spring :

When the hoar-frost upon the ground assumes
The image of its white sister, but not long
Lasts the fair copy that it strives to make,
The reedy shepherd rises, looks around,
Sees all the country whitened, smites his hands
And goes, a hapless wretch, bewailing home.
Then he returns, and garners hope again,
Seeing the world with face so quickly changed,
And takes his crook, and leads his flock to graze.

Or of the fire-flies in the valley, seen from the hill-side above ;
or of

The little rills which from the verdant slopes
Of Casentino flow to the Arno down
Making their cold clear channels.

Or the quarries of Carrara marble where dwelt Aronte :

Who in the hills of Luni, under which
The husbandmen of fair Carrara dwell,
Amid white marbles in a cavern lodged,
And from that height gazed out on stars and sea.

Or the pomp of war :

I have seen cavaliers upon the march,
Charging in fight, bidding their pennons fly,
And sometimes beating a retreat ; I have seen
The flying squadrons ravaging your land,
Ye of Arezzo, troops of horsemen swift
Revolving, tourney fights and tilting fields,
Full oft with trumpets, bells, and beat of drum,
Signals from fortress-towers of smoke and fire.

Again, there are those sentences of a lofty and austere morality
in which he rebukes the sins which have led to Hell, as

Not all the gold that is, or e'er hath been,
Beneath the moon can ever give repose
To one of all those weary spirits.

But we must pass on to the *Purgatorio*, much as there is yet to
be said on our present theme.

I am not sure that the *Purgatorio* is not the most beautiful
of the three poems. It has no such episode of passionate
beauty as the Paolo and Francesca, no such horror as the story
of Ugolino, but it is all religious and all lovely, the whole is
suffused with the glow of a sure and certain hope, it is the
record of punishment and suffering indeed, but these gladly borne,

because sin has deserved punishment, and because it is the way to Paradise. Cardinal Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* breathes the very innermost spirit of the *Purgatorio*, and is in one way its best explanation. "In Hell," says Dr. Hettinger, "the sole end of suffering is punishment; in Purgatory, suffering is rather solace than pain, for it leads to bliss eternal." I would notice in this connection that the great hymn of praise, *Te Deum laudamus*, is heard by Dante at the entrance of Purgatory. The marks of the seven deadly sins of which the temporal punishment was still to be borne, were traced on his brow by the angel, who sat without the door, which then the angel opened, bidding them enter, but to beware of looking back when once they were in. The door turned on its hinges with the sound of thunder. And on hearing that, Dante was attentive to another sound within.

Te Deum laudamus then I seemed to hear
In a voice mingled with that glorious sound,
It seemed like singing with an organ blent.

Well might they rejoice to bear all penalties, and suffer all woes, sure that they would be wholly healed at the last by their purgatorial suffering, and sure of this above all, that sin was put behind them, that they could sin no more.

The neglect of the poem by readers in England is, however, easily understood. In the first place it speaks of a realm of the world to come at which the ordinary Protestant scoffs, and his carelessness reacts in some measure on Catholic readers. Next, it is extremely difficult; and much of it cannot be understood without the aid of St. Thomas of Aquin, and of Treatises on Purgatory, as that of St. Catherine of Genoa. It requires a knowledge of the Offices of the Church, which even devout laymen do not always possess; it closes with visions and allegories demanding a knowledge of Italian contemporary history, for which in our over-occupied days we have but little time. But it is useful for religious meditation, and not only as a lovely poem. The personal experiences of Dante's own life become the exponents of the operations of Divine justice and grace. The whole work is the praise of the Sacrament of Penance.

We do not find in the *Purgatorio* many lines which have passed into household quotations, as in the *Inferno*, but it sparkles with beauty, and breathes the tones of the spring.

These are passages which, even in a translation, read like Milton's magnificent descriptions :

Refulgent gold, and silver thrice refined
And scarlet grain and ceruse, Indian wood
Of lucid dye serene, fresh emeralds
But newly broken, by the herbs and flowers
Placed in that fair recess, in colour all
Had been surpassed, as great surpasses less.

There is the description of the great angel who takes the souls to Purgatory in his boat :

Then on each side of it appeared to me
A something white, and under it by degrees
Came forth another whiteness. Still we looked
In silence till the first white grew to wings.
Then when my master saw at last who 'twas
That moved the boat he cried, Bend, bend thy knees !
Behold God's angel ! Now shalt thou behold
More of such heavenly ministrants. But see
How he disdains all human instruments,
Needing not oar nor sail, save his own wings
To make his way between so distant shores.

There are again the sights and sounds of nature, the planet Mars setting red through morning mist, the opening of the sheepfold :

As issues from the fold a flock of sheep
Timidly bending low their eyes and head,
As does the first, all doing, close behind,
Stopping if he stops, simple, quiet, meek,
Not knowing wherefore.

The work of the hedger :

A larger gap the farmer closes up,
Full often in his fence with one forkload
Of thorny brambles when the grapes grow black.

In the *Inferno* there was but one allusion to the hymns and services of the Church, and that was when the banners of Hell went forth to the parody of the words of the Office :

Vexilla Regis prodeunt Inferni ;

but in the *Purgatorio* the sacred Offices meet us at every turn. He quotes from the Psalms : *In exitu Israel* ; *Miserere*, as chanted antiphonally ; *Adhæsit pavimento* ; *Delectasti* ; *In te Domine speravi* ; *Deus venerunt gentes* ; *Beati quorum tecta sunt peccata (alternando)*. From the hymns and Offices of the

Church: *Salve Regina*; *Te lucis ante terminum*; *Te Deum laudamus*; *Gloria in excelsis*; *Labia mea Domine*; *Summe Deus clementiæ*; *Benedictus qui venit*; *Asperges me*. From the Gospels: *Vinum non habent*; *Beati mundo corde*, and the other Beatitudes; *Modicum et non videbitis me*, and many other passages from them and other portions of Holy Scripture.

We pass now to the *Paradiso*, and on this I need say but little. "The poet himself has declared that only few and chosen souls can follow him. In it the deep mysteries of nature and grace find their solution, and earnest students will be rewarded for its perusal, no less by the charm of its verse than by the solid instruction and interior consolation it conveys." It also, but even more than the *Purgatorio*, is simply incomprehensible without a careful study of dogmatic theology and the lives and writings of many of the great Saints and Doctors.

But to whomso will study it with attention, there is, next to Holy Scripture and the *Imitation*, no more devotional or consoling instruction, none which so fully answers the questions pressing on us, as they pressed on the intellect and the conscience of Dante's age. For instance:

A man first sees the light
On Indus banks, and there there is not one
To speak of Christ, or who can read or write.
All his desires are good, his deeds well done
So far as human nature can descry,
Sin, in his life and converse, there is none.
Without faith, unbaptized, he comes to die.
Is he condemned, what justice sanctions it?
What fault in him for unbelief can lie?

St. Thomas tells us that such a one is assuredly saved; Dante answers his own question by placing some, who lived and died externally as pagans, among the blessed. This is but one specimen of a multitude of difficulties, seeming to us modern, but really appertaining to the human intellect, which are resolved by the teaching of the Church, the only true theology, the only true philosophy.

It were to enter on subjects too deep for this lecture to dilate upon the vision of Heaven revealed to Dante, even if I had not trespassed too long on your time. I will only say that no mortal man has ever found it lawful or possible to speak so wonderfully of Heaven as Dante has done. Milton perhaps has come nearest him in the last few lines of *Lycidas*:

So Lycidas sunk low, but mounted high,
Through the dear might of Him that walked the waves,
To the blest Kingdoms meet of joy and love.
There entertain him all the saints above
In solemn troops and sweet societies,
That sing, and singing in their glory move
And wipe the tears for ever from his eyes.

And now one word in conclusion. If I have made out any reason for the study of Dante, you will ask me how you should read him, and in what translation, if you do not know Italian. Voltaire said of Dante, "Sa reputation s'affirmera toujours, parce qu'on ne le lit guere." It is witty, but happily not true; there are always earnest students of the great poet, and I believe there will be some amongst us.

First, let your reading be systematic. It is impossible to read Dante through as you may read the *Idylls of the King* or *The Ring and the Book*, and let it take its place among the literature which has gone to the storage of your mind. You must read him as you read your Bible or your *Imitation*. Auguste Comte, who has taught some of us so much, and has been to more than one in this room even as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, inculcated the constant study of the *Divina Commedia*, as a kind of religious exercise, one proof of the hold that the Church always has over souls once under her sway, even while they think or try to think they are free.

If any one will give half an hour a day, or less, to serious study, he will rapidly become a good Dante scholar, to his own infinite intellectual and spiritual benefit. For translations, I would say that one is almost as good as another, because I would have all used simply as cribs. Dante must be read with the Italian before you. And for that your knowledge of Latin will be sufficient aid. Ten lines of Dante mastered daily for a month will enable you to make greater progress than would easily be believed by those who have not tried this plan. Hazelfoot's translation in *tersa rima*, with the notes, may be recommended, or the late Sir Frederic Pollock's translation in blank verse, though, if accurate, it is sadly wooden. But the Italian at hand will supply the poetry and the grace.

And, as you read Dante, you will pass into a wondrous world, the like of which is unhappily no more to be seen except in literature and in memory. You will retrace the years back to the ages of faith, before men had dreamed of Protestantism, ere Luther and Calvin had blighted Europe with their curse.

We may have, thank God most of us here have, Dante's religion, but it is held in an alien atmosphere ; we gain the summit of a lofty mountain, yet draw our breath with pain.

The stream of the Church runs and will run through all time, life-giving, healing, purifying ; but it is fouled ever and anon with the garbage men throw into it, it sparkles less brightly because of the dark groves, religious and political, through which it has to find its way. To read Dante is to see it in all its purity and perfectness, is to raise before us an ideal after which we may strive ; it is to come into communion with the soul of a man as great perhaps as has ever trodden this earth, the saints of God excepted ; worthy to stand intellectually with our own Shakspeare, and spiritually with the great Fleming, Thomas Haemerlein of Kempen.

Song of Mary, the Mother of Christ:

CONTAINING THE STORY OF HIS LIFE AND PASSION. 1601.

FROM THE VOLUME WHICH CONTAINS, AND PROBABLY WRITTEN BY THE
AUTHOR OF, "*JERUSALEM MY HAPPY HOME*."¹

THE HOLY CHILDHOOD.

FAIN would I write, my mind ashamèd is,
My verse doth fear to do the matter wrong:
No earthly music good enough for this,
Not David's harp, nor Hierom's mourning song,
Nor Esaie's lips are worthy once to move,
Though Seraph's fire hath kindled them with love.

* * *

Then sing, O Saints, O holy Heavenly Choir,
And I shall strive to follow on your song;
This sacred ditty is my chief desire,
My soul to hear this music now doth long;
And longing thus, all whilst, there was no din,
They silent stood, to see who should begin.

For none did think him worthy to be one,
And every one to other there gave place;

¹ This portion of the "Song of Mary," copied in the British Museum Library (1893) by Orby Shipley, M.A., will form, it is hoped, a part of the Second Series of *Carmina Mariana*, to be published in the future.

But, bowing knees to Jesus every one,
 They Him besought for to decide the case :
 Who said to me, ' Most fit for this appears
 My Mother's plaint, and sacred Virgin's tears.'

* * *

But yet, in me far more than all the rest,
 Thy love, O Lord, and glory doth appear ;
 Extolling her that was the very least,
 Thy only Son, our Saviour, for to bear ;
 And lodge within so low and straight a room,
 The Judge of all in dreadful day of doom.

This sacred message, Gabriel, thou didst bring
 From God's own mouth unto my silly cell,
 How I, a Virgin, should conceive a King
 And Lord, Whom all the prophets did foretel :
 Oh, what a message seemed this to me,
 Unworthy once a Handmaid for to be.

* * *

The time expired ; in Bethlehem thou wert born,
 Where, in a crib upon a lock of hay
 'Twixt ox and ass, thou, Lord, didst think no scorn,
 Swaddled in clouts, thy Mother should thee lay :
 O Sacred Lord, sweet Son, what should I call ?
 My God, my Babe, my Bliss, and All in all.

* * *

O lowly place for him that was so high ;
 O happy stable, palace of the King ;
 You angels there did make us melody ;
 The silly shepherds said they heard you sing ;
 The shining Star from th' East did go before,
 And shew the Kings the place for to adore.

They laid their sceptres at my Saviour's feet,
And kissing them his God-head did adore ;
Offering their gifts, myrrh, gold, and incense sweet,
A present rich to them who seemed so poor ;
But they inspired, these offerings did bring,
For Christ their Priest, their Saviour, and their King.

* * *

After, my Lord, according to the Law,
Within the Temple I did thee present ;
Where Simeon, as soon as he us saw,
And in his arms thy little body hent,
To bless our God within he did not cease,
Desiring leave for to depart in peace.

'For now (quoth he) my aged eyes have seen
The saving health most pleasant to my sight,
Which of thy Saints hath long expected been,
The glory of the Jews and heathen nations light ;
Who yet by malice shall be much gain-said,
O worthy Babe, O happy Mother-Maid.'

All this was joy and comfort unto me,
Who did confer these sayings in my mind ;
Wherein such truth and light I still did see,
But Simeon added further : ' I do find
That, though thou Christ's elected Mother art,
The sword of sorrow shall transpierce thy heart.'

Oh, saying true in me, full many an hour,
Such is the way that God doth use with his ;
With comforts cross, with sweet to mix the sour,
'Twixt weal and woe, to wield them unto bliss :
The one doth show his goodness and his love ;
The other doth our grateful patience prove.

* * *

Seven years in Egypt living in exile,
 Joseph his axe, my needle in my hand,
 In poor estate we passèd all the while
 Amongst the simple people of the land :
 For all was heaven, for comfort we did sing,
 To lull our Babe and reverence our King.

Oh, how my cross was ever mixed with sweet,
 My pain with joy, mine earth with heavenly bliss,
 Who always might adore my Saviour's feet,
 Embrace my God, my loving Infant kiss ;
 And give him suck who gives the Angels food,
 And turn my milk into my Saviour's blood.

Sometimes he cast his hand about my neck,
 And smiling looked his Mother in the face ;
 Some joy, or skill I found in every beck,
 Each day discovered wisdom, love, and grace :
 I cannot utter what I did espy
 When I beheld his little glorious eye.

At seven years' end we did return again,
 And brought the Ark into his wonted place ;
 For he was dead that would my Lord have slain ;
 Thus worldly things do turn and change their face :
 But they which Jesus keep and do his will,
 In all events be one and happy still.

Yearly we went with others to adore
 Within the Temple, as the Law doth bid ;
 A holy place, but how doth he much more
 Who being Lord, a subject's duty did :
 O Christians, then, how ought you for to live ?
 Obedient to the laws the Church doth give.

And Christ my Son, now being twelve years old,
Thou didst bewray thy heavenly wisdom there
And midst the Doctors treasures didst unfold,
Joseph and I, meanwhile, affright with fear
For either weening other had my Child,
Each trusting other, either was beguiled.

My soul, remember what thy thoughts were then,
What griefs and fears did lodge within my breast,
Who now had lost the Joy of God and men,
My sacred Son, in whom my soul was blest :
What tears could serve to wail so great a loss ?
Lo, thus we still approachèd to the Cross.

Thus, three days spent in wailing, tears, and woe,
Behold, my Saviour in the Temple still :
Of whom I asked, ' My Son, why did you so ? '
' Must I not do (quoth he), my Father's will ? '
And so, you see, I learnèd by my grief,
Amongst all duties, that to God is chief.

Till thirty years my Lord at home did dwell,
Joseph and I enjoyed his presence still :
Where I myself abashèd am to tell,
How he in all obeyèd to my will :
How do you think I moved was to see
The Prince of Angels subject unto me ?

On the Secondary Education of Catholic Women.

[COMMUNICATED.]

IT is impossible to estimate at present the full extent of the changes that may be expected to result from the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the state of Secondary Education in this country. That the inquiry will be attended with most important changes in our existing methods is indubitable, except in the highly improbable event of its finding the actual condition of Secondary Education to be so perfect as to render any projected alterations superfluous. The State has stepped in, and henceforth she will regulate. When once she has tightened the rein, she rarely relaxes her hold, and there is every probability that much that has hitherto been optional will ere long become compulsory.

Whether or no the general and indiscriminate diffusion of "Higher Education" be *in itself* an unmitigated good, it is not our present purpose to inquire. Certain it is that an imperious and ever-increasing demand for it is one of the characteristics of the day, and must be met by an adequate and intelligently-organized supply, for the spirit of the age cannot be gainsaid. The state of public opinion on the subject, while it has found official expression in the institution of the inquiry, has for some time received practical embodiment in the establishment of such Training Colleges for Female Teachers as that under the management of Miss Hughes at Cambridge, and the Maria Grey College in London.

The advancement of education and the training of teachers are, in reference to at least one aspect of the subject, convertible terms, for an essential condition of the realization of any effectual scheme of education is the possession of teachers skilled in the art of tuition. On the superiority of trained over untrained teachers it seems superfluous for us to insist, but for the benefit of such of our readers as are yet unconverted on the subject, we quote the following words of Dr. Fitch, late Her Majesty's

Chief Inspector of Training Colleges. In a letter originally printed for private circulation, but now become public property, this gentleman writes: "All experience proves that—with a few rare exceptions—there is an immense difference between the trained and the untrained teacher. Teaching is a fine art; it has its rules and its principles; and it cannot be successfully practised by those who have not studied them. . . . There can be little doubt that the demand for such training will increase, and that, ere long, it will be deemed as discreditable for a person to become a professed teacher, as it is for one to enter the medical profession, without some systematic acquaintance with the principles of the art which he or she desires to practise." When the problem of providing teachers with full and efficient professional equipment has been solved, the problem of satisfying the educational needs of the country will practically have been solved also. The education of the future will be what the teachers of the future make it, and what they make it will depend upon the qualifications they bring to their work. Any reform in education must start with reform in the teaching body, and it is here that we may reasonably expect that State control will begin. Amongst the most probable changes that may result from the pending investigation, are the compulsory registration of all teachers, and the establishment of an obligatory standard of competency.

In the event of such an educational revolution as this, what will be the position of Catholics? One of two things must happen. Either we shall prepare to meet the approaching change by furnishing our teachers with such passports of efficiency as shall reach the imposed standard, or the future Secondary Education of Catholics will pass altogether out of Catholic hands. The latter alternative is incredible. Education, for us Catholics, means far more than it does for all the rest of the world, although, in the case of girls, it does not include the same curriculum of learning. For us, education, over and above the diffusion of knowledge, means *the moulding of Catholic individualities*. And our teaching Religious Orders (our remarks are of course confined to those engaged in female education), though they have not attained that technical proficiency which would entitle them to rank as professors of "Higher Education" in the modern acceptation of the term, have nevertheless supplied a system of moral training and mental discipline unequalled by any other existing institution. It is the recognition of this fact

that has induced the bulk of Catholic parents to relinquish the "advanced" processes of High School education in favour of the traditional system carried on in our convent schools. But the Catholics of England represent only a small minority of the population. The current of general opinion is running too fast to be stemmed; the most we can hope for is that it may be directed into beneficent channels. It is not to our credit that it should continue to be said in Anglican circles that "one never meets with a learned Catholic girl"—the assertion being invariably accompanied by the *sous-entendu* that if such a one were learned, she would cease to be Catholic. As was admirably pointed out in the article on this subject in the last issue of THE MONTH, even the convent schools themselves, with that wonderful power of response to the needs of the times which has ever been a characteristic of true Catholicity, have to a great extent modified their methods to suit modern requirements, and whilst retaining the general principles of the old system have engrafted upon it much that is new. They are following the times, but they follow "afar off," and no one realizes better than the nuns themselves that they are not "up to date." We were told not long ago that in one of our best convent schools several members of the community were privately taking lessons in perspective from a young drawing-mistress (herself an inferior teacher, but a "good Catholic" and the best available professional) in order that some one of them might obtain the South Kensington Diploma. It is touching to think of these professed Religious, some of them past maturity, reduced to such expedients as this in their conscientious endeavour better to qualify themselves for the duties of their vocation. Even for the curriculum of the ordinary convent course the nuns are almost invariably dependent upon lay assistance, and while in no single instance that we know of do convents prepare pupils for public examinations unless "at the request of parents," in many excellent convent schools girls are not subjected to public tests at all. A well-known Catholic gentleman, who is also an authority upon education, was recently about to send his daughters to one of our first-rate convent schools, but unlike the majority of Catholics, he wished them to have the advantages of "Higher Education." On his asking the nuns what were their tests, he received the reply that they did not prepare pupils for public examinations under any circumstances whatsoever. As a result, and much to his regret, this gentleman's

children are now attending a non-Catholic High School. We have this statement from his own lips.

Although the preparation for test examinations too often involves a system of "cramming" which may occasionally appear antagonistic in its results to the interests of true education, yet this evil, where it exists, would be minimized in the hands of a skilled teacher, and furthermore, the yearly increasing coercive force of public opinion is fast reducing the question of examinations to one of "Hobson's choice." If a girl wishes to be considered well-educated nowadays, she must satisfy the public educational tests. And although in the case of individuals, the application of these tests is legally optional and likely to remain so, there is every probability that in the case of schools the State will sooner or later step in and make the success at some determined examination of a given proportion of pupils an obligatory test of the *raison d'être* of every educational establishment; while it is practically certain that the attainment of a University standard will at no distant date become a compulsory condition of admission to the Teaching Body.

Now it appears to us of supreme moment that the future tuition of Catholic girls (no less than of boys) should remain in the hands of the Religious Orders, and the only way to secure this result is by affording our nuns the means of reaching that educational standard which at present is expected of all teachers by general public opinion and which ere long will be demanded of them by law.

The question has, we believe, for some time been occupying the attention of the English Hierarchy, and at the recent Synod the following resolution was unanimously passed by the Bishops: "We heartily approve of the establishment in some Catholic centre of a Catholic Training College to prepare women to become teachers in schools of Secondary Education."

The time has come for us to do for Secondary Education what we have so successfully achieved for Elementary Education in the Training College of Mount Pleasant at Liverpool, which compares favourably with any similar institution in the kingdom. But what satisfies the one standard will not suffice for the other, and a little inquiry has made manifest that, as matters stand at present, we are not in a position to found an independent Training College for Secondary Teachers, for the reason that with our existing resources the requisite material

to form an initial staff is not forthcoming. Such material as is available, is not suitable; and such material (there is not much of it) as might be suitable, is not available. What are we to do? Before we attempt to build our edifice, we must shape our blocks of stone. And in order to shape them after an approved model—in other words, in order to give an effectual training and preparation to our initial staff of teachers, the following is the scheme which, with the sanction of authority, now lies before the English Catholic world.

It is proposed to open at Cambridge a House of Residence for Catholic students, secular and religious, where, under the safeguard of an immediate Catholic environment, they may attend the complete course of lectures at Miss Hughes' Training College and receive preparation for obtaining the Cambridge Teaching Diploma. This scheme, which is fast wending its way from the region of *project* to that of *accomplished fact*, owes its origin to the initial energy and enterprise of Miss Donelan, a zealous Catholic lady, who would undertake the entire direction of the house, and who is now backed by a strong Committee of representative Catholics under the presidency of the Dowager Countess of Denbigh.

The whole course of study at Miss Hughes' College, which occupies one school year of thirty weeks, divided into three terms, includes lectures on the theory and the history of education; on school hygiene, on psychology and logic, on the art of teaching, on elocution, on class-singing, class-drawing, and calisthenics. Furthermore, as proficiency in the art of imparting knowledge can only come by exercise in it, the students are allowed "to practise in fourteen different schools in Cambridge of all classes and grades—of girls and of boys." This practical work is organized as follows: The student first carefully prepares her lecture, then rehearses it before a small audience consisting of the Principal of the College, the mistress of the school in which the lecture is to be given, and two fellow-students, all of whom criticize it from their different standpoints, and only when the lecture is revised according to the suggestions thus given, is it allowed to be delivered. In this way a young teacher learns to see all round her subject, to sift it of extraneous matter, and to adapt her treatment of it to the calibre of various minds before she ventures to express it in didactic form.

It is entirely due to the kindness of Miss Hughes, who is a personal friend of Miss Donelan, that the opportunity of

participation in this training has been opened out to Catholics. Through this lady's influence the Protestant Committee of the Training College have been induced to consent to the admission to it of Catholics, though limiting, at present, their number to six. If however, during the second year, application should be made to increase their number, we are assured it would not be refused. After conference with the heads of several religious houses, Miss Donelan has further been able to guarantee that such of the students as are Religious shall have every facility offered to them for the observance of their Rule, so that while attending the College lectures they may in almost every particular be able to continue their community life. In view of this, special arrangements have recently been made that the first year's contingent of students shall include at least three professed nuns from one of our best teaching Orders. This will have the double advantage that, while it secures first-rate professional training to the class we are most desirous to see in possession of it, the constant presence of Religious will have the effect of accentuating and deepening the Catholic tone of the house and surround with an atmosphere of faith such of their secular fellow-students as might otherwise find intellectual temptation in the vicinity of a non-Catholic University.

It is expressly stated that this House of Residence is not to be, nor to be allowed to develop into, a Catholic College at Cambridge. It simply furnishes the necessary intermediary step—the *missing link*—towards the foundation of a separate College of our own in some Catholic centre yet to be determined on. Such a College would probably be under the management of a Religious Order, somewhat after the pattern of the admirable private Training College of the Notre Dame Nuns at Namur, with the difference that the English College would admit secular as well as religious students, and thus give an opening for the establishment of Catholic High Schools, side by side with a fresh development of the convent schools.

The chief objections raised against Miss Donelan's scheme have been that the establishment in Cambridge of a House of Residence for Catholics appears to give a sanction to the principle of mixed education, and endangers the faith of our students by wantonly exposing them to influences which are undoubtedly hostile to a Catholic spirit. Added to this, there is the consideration that a course of psychology as taught at

Cambridge would necessarily involve much that is antagonistic to Catholic doctrine.

With regard to the first point, and valuing the scheme at its worst, we are inclined to consider it as a *pis aller*. It is certain that, in order to keep pace with the times, Catholic teachers must be qualified for their calling by more extensive acquirements and more careful training than they have hitherto received. It is equally certain that we have not at present the means to give them such training ourselves. We are forced to fall back upon some non-Catholic Training College, all of which are more or less (in proportion to their excellence) in connection with one of the Universities, either London or Cambridge. If we are therefore obliged to have recourse to the Universities in order to prepare ourselves to become ultimately independent of them, it is surely better to do so as much as possible under Catholic auspices. If our teachers are to go to Cambridge, it is surely advisable that they should go under conditions such as Miss Donelan's scheme promises, which will surround them with an atmosphere of Catholicity and afford them every opportunity for practising their religion. And again, if we desire that the work of Catholic education should, in the main, continue in religious hands, it is surely foolish to quarrel with a plan which, while it secures first-class training to nuns, at the same time offers them every facility for the observance of their Rule.

Furthermore, as has already been stated, the House of Residence is to be *temporary*, pending the construction of a College, for which it is to furnish the materials. The inauguration of the latter will abolish the Cambridge House. The cocoon will disappear when the organism it sheltered, having reached perfection, needs it no longer.

Regarding the two latter points of objection, our Cardinal Archbishop has to a great extent safeguarded us against the dangers they anticipate by his reiterated insistence that all Catholic students, boys and girls alike, should be thoroughly grounded in Catholic philosophy before they are allowed to enter upon any other branches of Higher Education. Such a course of study would involve the refutation of those theories upon which much of modern free-thought is based, and a Catholic who, under proper direction, had successfully passed through a course dealing with the doctrines of Mill, Huxley, Bain, Spencer, and other exponents of nineteenth-century doubt, would hold his, or her, faith upon a far firmer

basis and possess a far greater power of beneficent influence upon others, than one who had been reared in a spiritual hot-house, where the breath of these things enters not. We can only vanquish our foe by meeting him. To evade is not to conquer. And in order to successfully defend our stronghold, we must accurately measure the strength and estimate the position of the attacking force.

The time is come when our girls, no less than our boys, must have an intellectual, as well as a traditional and conscientious, basis for their faith. We trust we shall not be accused of revolutionary ideas if we say that, up till now, the convent schools have accentuated the spiritual side of education somewhat at the expense of the intellectual side. And though the former is of more vital importance to the individual, the latter is a more potent means of salutary influence in a country where, as in England, keen intellectuality rules the day, where our Catholic laity live under conditions which sooner or later must bring them into contact with those floods of heresy and unbelief in which this unhappy land is swamped, and where every Catholic, no matter how mundane his life may be (often by reason of its mundanity), may, if he will, find some missionary work to do.

In conclusion, it may be said that, though Miss Donelan's scheme may not be perfect, it appears infinitely preferable to certain alternatives that are looming forth from the background; and though it may not, in itself, represent our ideal, it offers a very practical solution of the problem as to how that ideal may ultimately be attained. We aim at the heights, but we must traverse the valleys to reach them; and though the path pointed out to us appears tortuous, it will nevertheless lead to our goal, if we will only have the courage and the patience to climb.

A. J. S.

Modern Witchcraft and Modern Science.

IN No. 192 of the *Nineteenth Century*, for the month of February, 1893, was published an article by Mr. Ernest Hart, entitled, "The Revival of Witchcraft." In the New York *Popular Science Monthly* for August, 1893, was printed an article with the same title, by the same author. Evidently he wished all English-reading people to know what he had to say about his subject.

The article, as seen in the *Nineteenth Century*, contains an interesting account of how he investigated alleged phenomena of "the new psychology" in the Hospital of La Charité at Paris. In the course of some preliminary observations, he says :

France was now, as in the last century, the chosen land of marvels. There appears to be something in the temperament of the Latin race which lends itself easily to neurotic disorder, to hysterical excitement, and to the production of startling displays of mental eccentricity. We have never been celebrated in this country, even in the middle ages, for our demoniacs, our dancing hysterics, or our miraculous cures. We have nothing to rival the ancient histories of St. Medard and Port Royal, or the modern pilgrimages of Lourdes. (p. 348.)

The author appears to have forgotten the facts that, in the middle ages, we were noted for our belief in the supernatural, for our devotion to the Virgin Mary, for our confidence in her intercessions, for pilgrimages to various shrines, for our faith in the miracles which were there wrought, or expected ; as well as for our trust in "touching for the King's-evil," which continued from 1058 to 1714. He continues :

But if the modern hypnotists, psychists, and faith-curers are allowed the full play, which has recently been given to them, in infecting the public mind with the follies of the "new hypnotism," the "profound hypnosis," the "new mesmerisms," the "magnetization of hypnotics," and the "externalization of sensation," which they have been so solemnly propounding and so profusely describing in the pages of our leading newspapers and serials, we may yet see here an abundant

harvest of mentally disordered and pathological creatures, such as have now for some years been permanently on show across the channel. (p. 348.)

Whether Mr. Hart means to class as "mentally disordered and pathological creatures" only hypnotic subjects and the persons who, among modern pilgrims of Lourdes and other places, have been mysteriously cured, or whether in that class he includes likewise all pilgrims and all who believe in such cures and have faith in the faith-curer, does not expressly appear. The psychological and "pathological" conditions, however, of all these people are evidently cognate. All pilgrims and all believers in the faith-curer are continually asking for the healing of friends or awaiting the occasion to be themselves healed. If there be a difference between subjects of cures and those who are praying for them, it is plainly one controlled by circumstances, one of degree and not of kind. Therefore all who practise, all who favour "modern pilgrimages," and all who believe that through faith unsound people may be made whole, are, by Mr. Hart's definition, already "mentally disordered and pathological creatures."

It should be remarked that he classes the "modern pilgrimages of Lourdes" with "the ancient histories of St. Medard and Port Royal," and cites them all together as notable instances of "demoniacs, dancing hysterics, and miraculous cures." The reader should also notice the implied assertion that faith-curers, in company and making common cause with "hypnotists and psychists," infect the public mind by propounding and profusely describing certain follies, which are mentioned, but among which, let it be noted, cures by faith are not named. It is hardly needful to point out that, in making this assertion, Mr. Hart spoke, to say the least, rashly, without the care and exactness which might have been expected of a scientific investigator; nor is it necessary to add, what is generally known, that the faith-curer has no concord with the hypnotizer, nor with the mesmerizer, nor with the magnetizer. A little later, in the same article, the author has, in effect, admitted that the faith-curer and the hypnotist "are not brothers in their faith and philosophy."

After having indicated the lamentable prevalence of "neurotic disorder" and "hysterical excitement" across the channel, and expressed his fear lest this sort of "eccentricity" should be imported, Mr. Hart recounts how he was induced to "devote a fortnight at the end of the year to an investigation of the facts

described and the phenomena produced, and to an endeavour to find out how they were produced, and, as is always important in an inquiry of the sort, in what sort of people they took place."¹

So far as appears, the investigator's examination was confined to the "performances at La Charité—one of the greatest and most historically celebrated of the Paris hospitals," where "the business of demonstrating the marvels of the new hypnotism has been going on now for upwards of twenty years, with very mischievous effects." He proceeds to explain how by him were detected the gross and disgusting deceptions practised in the performances at La Charité. Every truth-loving reader must applaud the cleverness and conclusiveness of the tests employed and the experiments devised. They enabled the examiner to affirm in the columns of *The Times* that he "found the whole series of performances to be based upon fraud." He adds some intimations warranting the remark: "We see here to what excesses this so-called science of hypnotism may lead."

Mr. Hart's narrative ends here. In the summing up of his conclusions, he says:

Of course the question will be asked, Are the practical uses or the applications of the artificial sleep (the induction of which is the residuum of this psychological puddle) of such value as to counter-balance its evils? As to its surgical uses, which at first sight are the most obvious, Luys himself says: "At the present time the application of hypnotism to surgical therapeutics is of absolutely no account." In the domain of medicine M. Luys is naturally more hopeful and more affirmative, but obviously inspires less confidence than his calmer and more critical colleagues at the Salpêtrière, who have abstained from following him in these new developments and who regard them with disfavour and distrust. To me the so-called cures by hypnotism seem to rank in precisely the same class as those of the faith-curer. (p. 366.)

If the alleged miraculous cures at Lourdes and other places had a fixed, well-known, and universally accepted value as a standard of pathological condition, and as a measure by which the proportions of psychological perturbations and phenomena could be ascertained, such cures, without further definition, might have been conveniently and properly used by Mr. Hart in this place for the sake of scientific exactness and perspicuity.

All the world knows, however, that no such absolute nec

¹ P. 348.

conventional value exists; that, on the contrary, the alleged phenomena, called miraculous cures, and cures of the faith-curer, have no value of any kind which can be used as a term in the expression of facts or theories pertaining to psychiatry, pathology, or psychology. Mr. Hart's violent equation is, therefore, very like and about as definite as that sometimes vulgarly used to give an idea of size, namely: "big as a piece of chalk." The assumption of such a value by that gentleman is gratuitous, in nothing strengthens his reasoning, is foreign to his investigation. He did not even profess that he intended to examine cures of the faith-curer, or alleged miracles; saw no cure, no pretended cure; referred to none in his investigation. Why, as a scientific man, should he go to La Charité in order to pronounce a judgment on the declared miracles of Lourdes? Why, as a man of science, go out of his way to drag such reported miracles into the unholy company of fraudulent hypnotic performances, and make them figure in his show of "witchcraft revived," unless, indeed, he produced proofs that they were worthy of such company? Why, as a careful investigator, did he postulate that moot point? To the unscientific mind this proceeding appears to be neither scientific nor scrupulous.

Mr. Hart's experiments, directed to test exhibitions of the "new mesmerism," the "externalization of sensation," "communication by contact," "transference across space," and so forth, convinced him that the asserted phenomena were performances based upon fraud, and thence he deduced, or ventured to proclaim, that to him "medical cures by hypnotism seem to rank in precisely the same class as those of the faith-curer." A cognate deduction follows, namely: "The hypnotic *endormeur* is very well able to explain the miracles of faith-cure and pilgrimage by the light of his own experience." By reading a little further it may be seen how, as he imagines, his position is made good. Deception, in his view, is likewise the basis of faith-cures without distinction.

They result, as he [*i.e.*, the hypnotic *endormeur*] explains accurately, from the reaction of mind on body, the effects of imagination, of self-suggestion, or of suggestion from without. Those who are benefited by them are especially the fervent and the enthusiastic, the vividly imaginative, the mentally dependent, and, above all, the hysterical—male or female. But clearly the faith-curer may retort upon the hypnotizer that they are brothers in their therapeutic results, if not in

their faith and philosophy. The one can work about the same percentage of cures as the other, and no more; and the intervening apparatus, whether of magnets, mirrors, or of grottoes, only serve to affect the imagination and to supply "the external stimulus" which is necessary. (p. 366.)

"The faith-curer plays upon the springs of self-suggestion. The patient is told to believe that he will be cured, to wish it fervently, and he shall be cured."¹ And so, according to this author, while the deceived patient religiously trusts that he is the subject of a special or miraculous grace from on high, he is only a dupe, healing himself by the most ordinary means.

Mr. Hart appears to have underrated the importance of facts connected with this matter of cures, as manifested, for instance, at Lourdes; to have been ignorant of, or purposely to have disregarded, those which are most difficult to explain plausibly: At any rate, through inadvertence, or otherwise, he seems to occupy the position of a man who undertakes with assurance to interpret phenomena of which he betrays a striking want of knowledge. He takes for granted the identity of hypnotic cures and "cures of the grotto," the convertibility of the psychologic, neurotic, and pathologic conditions of hypnotic subjects and of faith subjects. Facts bearing upon the error of such assumption will presently be adduced.

Although the question of miracle or no miracle is one to which many are entirely indifferent, yet, probably, all accept as miraculous "an event which cannot be explained by, or is contrary to, or a deviation from the known laws of nature;" hence, at least, extra-natural. Hypnotism, according to its propounders, with all its revelations, is understood to be manifestations of empirical psychology, subjects for psychologic inquiry, entirely within the domain of, and acting in full harmony with, natural laws. One of its great values has been thought to be its potency as a solvent of miracles, and for this use it has frequently been brought forward. But this investigator demonstrates that its asserted revelations are not revelations at all, but frauds, fictions, tricks; declares "that no new faculty was ever yet developed in any of these hypnotics. The frauds of clairvoyance, of spirit perceptions, of gifts of language, of slate-writing, of spirit-writing, of far-sight, of 'communication across space,' of 'transfer of mental impressions,' of the development of any new sense or ghost of a

¹ P. 366.

sense remains now as ever, for the most part, demonstrable frauds, or, perhaps, in a few cases self-deceptions."¹

Therefore a miracle cannot be resolved by such manifestations. They do not explain, prove, nor disprove anything; unless, indeed, the reader adopts Mr. Hart's method and conclusion, which seem to be something like this: Hypnotic performances are fraudulent deceptions, or self-deceptions, *ergo* miracles of faith-cure are fraudulent deceptions, or self-deceptions. He makes frequent mention of "the priestly faith-curer of the grotto," "the faith-curer of the grotto," "the faith-curer of Lourdes," "the miracles of faith-cure and pilgrimage," "the faith-curer of the chapel and grotto," but does not define, does not at all explain the meaning with which he uses this term, "faith-curer of the grotto," and its equivalents, except so far as is intimated in the phrase: "The patient is told to believe that he will be cured, to wish it fervently, and he shall be cured."

To a person acquainted with the history of Lourdes since the beginning of the year 1858, such language, referring to the cures wrought, or happening there, seems strangely inexact and out of place in the mouth of a careful investigator. Precedents for this style, however, may be found in the proceedings of men of science, who speak positively touching the phenomena in question, affirm and deny without scrutiny, without so much as a casual personal examination, even without informing themselves as to the bare outlines; like that well-known lecturer at the Salpêtrière, who, referring to the reported miracles at Lourdes, publicly asserted as facts what the Bishop of Nevers and Dr. Saint-Cyr, President of the Society of Doctors of la Nièvre, to mention no others, positively, pointedly, and publicly denied: facts which, had they ever existed, must have come under the immediate personal notice of these two gentlemen. The man of science, thus convicted, was silenced, indeed, but he made no retraction, though repeatedly and publicly called upon and challenged to prove or to retract, nor any reparation of any kind.

Now, had Mr. Hart glanced ever so briefly at the history of "the grotto," he would have learned that from the 11th of February, 1858, the date of the first alleged "apparition," till the 28th of July, when the Bishop of the diocese appointed a commission to scrutinize the asserted facts, the clergy had, by superior order, utterly abstained, not only from going to the

¹ P. 367.

grotto, but from taking any part, or giving any the least occasion for saying that priests were concerned in the matter; and that from the 25th of February, 1858, when "the water of Lourdes" first sprang from the dry earth under the hands of the child-shepherdess, Bernadette, in the presence of marvelling thousands of spectators, and while this girl still referred to the averred apparition as "the Lady," wonderful cures began to be reported as having been wrought through the instrumentality of this water, till even the prelate, who, with great prudence, had held himself and his priests aloof, was forced so far to yield before the evidence as, on the said 28th of July, to consent and order that a thorough and scrupulous inquiry be made.

Among the cures which were asserted to have taken place during the period extending from the 25th February, 1858, to the inquiry ordered by the Bishop, and which were examined by the commission, one of the first was that of Blaisette Soupenne, of Lourdes. She was about fifty years old, had been for a long time suffering from chronic inflammation of the eyelids, complicated with atrophy, and her state was most grievous. A continual watering of the eyes; acute smartings, sometimes simultaneous, sometimes alternate; lids bloodshot, completely turned outward, and entirely stripped of lashes; the two lower lids covered with a multitude of fleshy excrescences; this was the woman's condition. Declared incurable by science, she addressed herself to the miraculous "Lady" of the grotto, asking that this cruel malady, against which the knowledge of men and the agents of nature had been powerless, might be taken away from her. After the first lotion of the water of the grotto she felt a great alleviation. At the second, which took place the next day, the cure was perfect, the watering of the eyes ceased, the lids returned to their natural position, the fleshy excrescences disappeared, from that day the lashes came back.¹

Another case, investigated by this commission, was that of Henry Busquet, then fifteen years old, of Nay, in the Basses-Pyrénées. In consequence of a long and violent typhoid fever, two years before, an abscess had formed on the right side of his neck, and had gradually reached the top of his chest and the bottom of his cheek. The pain of it was agonizing. Dr. Subervielle lanced this abscess about four months after its formation. It discharged an immense quantity of sero-purulent

¹ Lasserre, *Notre Dame de Lourdes*.

matter; but with time the malady grew worse. In the region indicated above was an extended, gaping ulcer, covering the upper part of the chest, all one side of the neck, and threatening the face, furnishing an abundant suppuration. Besides, two new glandular swellings appeared at the side of this frightful ulcer.

Such was the boy's state when he begged a neighbour to bring him some water of Lourdes, which he did on the evening of April 28th. Towards eight o'clock that same evening, after prayers by the child and all his family, he went to bed, took off the bandages and lint which covered the ulcer and tumours, and, using a piece of linen wet with the water of the grotto, he bathed and washed his sores. Presently he fell into a profound sleep. When he awoke all his pain had ceased, the sores were closed, the swellings had disappeared, the ulcer was only a solid scar.¹

At the same place, a widow, already old, Madame Madeleine Rizan, was at the point of death. Her life, at least for the last twenty-five or more years, had been a long succession of sufferings. Attacked in 1832 by the cholera, her left side had remained almost entirely paralyzed, and one of her hands was completely atrophied. She was a prey to vomitings of blood. Her stomach could support no solid food. Gravies, *purées*, coffee had sufficed to sustain in her the vacillating flame of life, always ready to go out, and powerless to warm the wretched body. The poor woman was always cold. Even in the heats of July and August she asked to see constantly the fire on the hearth, and to have her old invalid-chair brought near it. For the last sixteen or eighteen months her condition had been aggravated: the paralysis had become complete on her left side, and had begun to encroach upon the right leg. The atrophied members were swollen beyond measure. She had left the old arm-chair for her bed, could not make a movement, was no more than an inert mass. Her insensible limbs were, so to speak, gathered and folded on themselves. She lay continually on her side, in form of the letter Z. All hope had been abandoned by Dr. Talamon and Dr. Subervielle, who successively had attended her. Lubine, a daughter, lived with and nursed her devotedly. Though her paralyzed members had become insensible, the sufferings of this unfortunate woman, sometimes in the stomach or abdomen, sometimes in the head, were excruciating. The unchanged position which her body was obliged

¹ Lasserre, *Notre Dame de Lourdes*.

to preserve had produced two sores, one in the hollow of her chest and one in the groin. On her side, in several places, the skin was worn by the long rubbing of the bed, and allowed the flesh to be seen, denuded and bloody. The patient had received Extreme Unction. Her agony was prolonged in the midst of intolerable sufferings. At her request, the Sisters of the Cross, at Igon, of whom her sister-in-law was the Superior, made a *neuvaine* to obtain the Virgin's intercession for a cure or for death.

On a Saturday a violent crisis announced the approach of the last moment. The spitting of blood was almost continual. A livid tint spread over the patient's emaciated countenance. Her eyes became glassy. Her voice was only heard as she often murmured, "Lord, how I suffer! Can I then not die?" "She will die in the night, or, at latest, when comes the dawn," said Dr. Subervielle. "There is no more oil in the lamp."

Kneeling before a statue of the Virgin, Lubine prayed, without earthly hope. It was now near midnight. The profound silence was only interrupted by painful breathing of the dying woman. "My daughter," spoke she. Lubine went to her. "My good child, go to our friend, Madame Nessans, who was coming back from Lourdes this evening. Ask her for a glass of the water of the grotto. It is that water which is going to cure me. The Virgin wishes it." "My dear mother," replied Lubine, "it is too late. I cannot leave you alone, and everybody is in bed at Madame Nessans'. To-morrow morning I will get some at the earliest moment." "Let us wait, then," and the sufferer was silent.

In the morning (Sunday) Lubine fetched a bottle of the water of the grotto. Madame Rizan drank several mouthfuls. "O my daughter! my daughter!" exclaimed she; "it is life that I drink. There is life in this water! Rub my face with it! rub my arm with it! rub my whole body with it!" Lubine dipped a linen cloth in the water and bathed the visage of her mother, who cried out in a voice now clear and strong, "I feel myself cured! I feel myself cured!"

Lubine bathed the paralyzed and tumefied limbs, and, with an inexpressible mixture of happiness and terror, saw the enormous swelling subside and suddenly disappear under her hand, and the skin, violently strained and shining, take its natural aspect. In a moment, fully, without transition, life and health reappeared beneath her fingers. And thus this dying

body of Madame Rizan, moistened with the "water of Lourdes," had recovered the plenitude of its strength. After the first outpouring of thanks, she said: "I am hungry; I want some meat and some bread, my daughter. I have eaten none for twenty-five years." And she ate. Then she got up and dressed herself. She was, indeed, perfectly cured.

It may be added, parenthetically, that ten years later the writer of the foregoing account visited Madame Rizan, who was then seventy-one years old, and found her in the full health of a green old age, with none of the infirmities that years bring with them, and no trace of so many ills and sufferings.¹

These and many other like cures occurred through the instrumentality of the "water of the grotto," between the 25th February, when the fountain first appeared, and the investigation of the commission, without the intervention of a "priestly" or any other visible or audible "faith-curer." Who, then, is the entity or agent to whom Mr. Hart alludes as "the faith-curer of the grotto"?

All these cures were examined by the commission, of which at least two well-known doctors of medicine made a part. It recognized the fact that there are miracles and miracles, faith-cures and faith-cures, and divided the cases into three classes. In the first were those which, however striking, were susceptible of a natural explanation, including all those patients who Mr. Hart says can be benefited by the faith-cure. In the second were those which inclined to the inexplicable; and the third comprised cures altogether inexplicable.

The Report of this commission confirmed the asserted facts and, especially in the third class, their marvellous character. But the Bishop, in his extreme prudence, asked the sanction also of time before pronouncing the episcopal verdict. He allowed three years to elapse. Then he ordered a second inquiry in regard to these same cures. The cures examined in the first investigation were found to have been radical and permanent. Finally, on January 18, 1862, three years, eleven months, and seven days after the first alleged apparitions, Bishop Laurence by a *mandement* declared what has since become a belief of the Catholic world relative to the apparitions and the miracles of Lourdes.²

It can be thought that this commission, though composed of persons eminently respectable, may have been, on the whole,

¹ Lasserre, *Notre Dame de Lourdes*.

² *Ibid.*

incompetent; may have erred for various reasons; that its conclusions are not, as a matter of course, to be accepted as indubitable. It can also be thought that possibly they may be true; that a doubt is warrantable; that in the absence of a counter-examination, equally careful and conscientious, no one can dispute them.

But to simple, unscientific minds, one thing seems absolutely clear, namely, that in this matter the authorities of the Church acted according to the dictates of honesty, of common sense, and of science, whose aim and end is truth, and that the scientific world acted very much as though it were guided by "the spirit that always denies"—

Ich bin der Geist, der stets verneint !—

losing thought of the truth which science seeks while contemplating the effect that the confirmation of a given truth might produce. The Church scrupulously investigated the "cures of the grotto" before forming or expressing an opinion, and before asserting or denying anything in the premises; the scientific world formed and expressed an opinion, asserted and denied positively, indifferently, or passionately, before making any, the most superficial, examination.

The ecclesiastical commission found abundant proof that many of the reported cures "could not be explained by, or were contrary to, or a deviation from, the known laws of nature;" that they thus answered the definition of the word miracle, and that therefore, by this word, of which it had no superstitious fear, the character of such cures was properly and conveniently designated.

Mr. Hart may, indeed, reduce to nothing the value of the commission's work by a mere observation, as thus: Their conclusion itself proves beyond question that the members were "mentally disordered and pathological creatures," and, as such, incapable of forming a conclusion. Upon his assertion, however, that "the hypnotic *endormeur* is very well able to explain the miracles of faith-cure and pilgrimage by the light of his own experience," you join issue with him and demand the proofs. You challenge him to produce the hypnotic *endormeur*, or even the hypnotic *endormi*, who can explain, for instance, the cure of Pierre de Rudder.

Pierre de Rudder, a working man, was born at Tabbeke, in Western Flanders. By the fall of a tree, on February 16,

1867, his leg was broken nine centimetres below the knee. Dr. Affenaer, of Oudenberg, set the bone, but it did not re-unite. Five weeks after the accident a large sore appeared in the foot, and the bone corrupted. Dr. Affenaer could do nothing to arrest the evil, nor could Dr. Jacques, of Bruges, and, afterwards, Dr. Verriet, of the same place. Three other doctors, from Stabille, Varsena, and Brussels, were equally unsuccessful. The patient, after enduring frightful tortures, and keeping his bed for an entire year, was finally able to drag himself about somewhat on crutches. In this condition he continued eight years and two months. In the depths of a large sore, continually suppurating, might be seen the two parts of the bone, distant three centimetres the one from the other. The foot could be turned in every direction, and the heel brought up to the knee. The lower was feebly held to the upper part of the leg.

In this case, Pierre de Rudder, having heard of the marvels which were said to have been wrought at Lourdes-Oostacker through the intercession of the Virgin Mary, prepared himself by fervent prayers for the painful pilgrimage thither; and, on the 7th April, 1875, overcoming all difficulties, he reached the Grotto of Lourdes-Oostacker, utterly exhausted. His wish was to join the pilgrims, who were going three times about the little mountain, according to custom. After resting a while on a bench, and being refreshed by a draught of water from the fountain, he took his crutches and drew himself along till he arrived in front of the miraculous statue, where he sat down on a bench. While praying ardently his whole being was seized by a strange trouble. Beside himself, he rose, as if unconsciously, without his crutches, passed between the benches, and knelt before the image of the Virgin. After some minutes of prayer, during which the strange disturbance continued, he came as it were to himself, and perceived with astonishment that he had not his crutches, and that he was kneeling. "My God!" he cried, "where am I?" He arose, took the crutches, placed them against the rock of the grotto, and then finished the three turns of the pilgrimage. He was taken to the *château* of Courtebourne, where it was ascertained that the leg was made perfectly whole; the parts of the bone had been joined, and the sores had instantaneously disappeared. A scarcely perceptible blue mark alone indicated the place of the lesion. Dr. Affenaer, examining the leg, let fall big tears, and exclaimed, "You are radically cured; your leg is like that

of an infant just born." In the parish church at Tabbeke, thanks for this prodigious grace were rendered by a *neuvaine* of High Masses. Fifteen hundred people were often present at these services out of a population of two thousand.¹

The scene of this alleged cure is easy of access ; the subject and many of the witnesses must be still alive. Pierre de Rudder himself believes in it so firmly that, since it occurred, he has made at least one hundred and seventeen pilgrimages to the Grotto of Lourdes-Oostacker in commemoration of it. As reported, there would seem to be no chance of fraud in this case, except on an impractically large scale. Was it not worth Mr. Hart's consideration? When accounts of cases like this may be read by any person, was it not worth while for this investigator to make himself acquainted with such a one, the subject of which would appear to be outside of his list of persons susceptible to cure by faith? Honestly, was it not his duty thus to inform himself before, as a teacher, speaking so positively?

Another restoration, which the hypnotic *endormeur's* method does not satisfactorily explain, occurred more recently.

Sister Julienne, *tourière* of the Ursuline Convent at Brives, in the last days of August, 1889, was dying of galloping consumption. Six doctors examined and pronounced upon her case without disagreement. On the first day of the following September she was carried to the station to take the five o'clock train for Lourdes. The controller, putting her into a car, said : "They are mad. Such temerity should not be permitted. They will certainly bring back a corpse." At Lourdes, in the morning of the next day, she was borne to the pool. The ladies in charge refused to bathe her. "She is a consumptive," said they, "and in the last stage." This objection was overruled. When Sister Julienne touched the water her jaw fell and her mouth remained open ; her breathing seemed to cease ; her paleness was that of a corpse. They thought she had expired ; took her immediately from the water ; laid her on the step which leads to the pool, and sought some sign of life. The left side of her body had not even been wetted. At this moment a faint colour appeared in her cheeks ; her eyes opened somewhat ; her chest dilated ; she arose and stood alone ; suddenly her look brightened ; a new life animated her ; she refused to sit ; dressed herself without help, and walked unassisted to the grotto.

¹ Boissarie, *Lourdes, Histoire Medicale.*

Seven doctors verified the cure, and found no trace of any lesion, nor even of a simple congestion of the lungs.¹

Will the reports of cases, vouched by the testimony of honourable persons like these, induce Mr. Hart to examine, or to enlarge his examination, or at least to revise his expressions without further examination?

In a certificate, dated September 10, 1876, Dr. Martel, of Beziers, says that he attended Marie Moreau, a Religious, for a tumour of the right breast, which proved to be a cancer. He proposed its extirpation, but without insisting, for fear that the patient could not bear the operation, on account of her great weakness; and, judging the evil to be without remedy, and death near, he prescribed only what the sore demanded for the sake of cleanliness. The 14th August, 1876, this patient presented herself to Dr. Martel, saying that she was cured. In fact, there was no tumour, no suppuration, no pain, only a fresh lineal scar. She, who the day before was bent upon her side, had now a natural position and was really cured, as she had affirmed.

The 3rd August, all the community, in union with the invalid, had begun a *neuvaine* to Our Lady of Lourdes. The last night of the *neuvaine* they had placed on the cancer a compress wet with the water of Lourdes. The patient went to sleep sitting up in bed, and, on waking two hours later, carried her hand to her breast and perceived that the tumour had completely disappeared.²

Is the hypnotic *endormeur* yet puzzled? Is he now at fault? Here is a case which shows the patient to have had the devotion and faith for which "we" were "celebrated" in the "middle ages."

Between 1883 and 1889, Pierre Delannoy had been sixteen times under treatment in Paris hospitals (in eight different hospitals, beginning with the Salpêtrière and passing through La Charité). Twelve doctors, the first of whom was the late Professor Charcot, had declared the name and nature of his malady. He had been hung fifty times, burned with red-hot irons yet oftener. Cauteries had been applied. "The diagnosis of his disease was written on the patient's back in indelible characters." Not only did he suffer from *Ataxie Locomotrice*, but he was long past the first and second periods, and was now entering upon the third, the paralytic period of Charcot.

¹ Boissarie, *Lourdes, Histoire Médicale.*

² *Ibid.*

Yet Delannoy was cured suddenly on August 20, 1889, at Lourdes ; not in the pool, but kneeling on the flag-stones of the grotto, when the Holy Sacrament was passing near him. Thus kneeling, his forehead bowed to the stones, which he humbly kissed, while the throng was crying, "Lord, heal us," this suffering workman said, in a loud voice, "Our Lady of Lourdes, heal me if you please, and if you judge it necessary." Immediately he felt a distinct sensation, as of a force impelling him to rise and walk. He did rise ; he did walk ; unaided, without feeling either pain or trouble, but with a complete and definite co-ordination of all his movements. In reply to an inquiry, this telegram was sent from Paris on September 1 : "We have seen Delannoy four times this week ; the doctors are upset ; he walks like a country postman."¹

Away from Lourdes, and without the instrumentality of its water, strange things occur, well worthy the attention and study of those who wish to talk intelligently, much more those who determine to speak authoritatively of these matters. Such is that of which the account follows. Let it be noted that the patient and the persons chiefly concerned are not of the "Latin race," but loyal British subjects, with nothing hysterical "in their temperaments."

In the autumn of 1891, the writer of these words, while in Florence, Italy, heard from the lips of Dr. William Baldwin a statement, of which the following is a condensed recital. It may be remarked that Dr. Baldwin is not a Catholic, is a believer in science, the son of a Presbyterian minister.

Mr. Henry C. Campbell, a youngish Scotch gentleman, for some time resident in Florence, passed the summer of 1889, with his family, at Klobenstein in the Tyrol. While there, through an accident, he received, in the right frontal region, a double fracture of the skull, and also an injury to four ribs. The Tyrolean doctor did not discover the fracture. Mr. Campbell was brought to Florence, his sufferings always increasing, and Dr. Baldwin was called to him, who, towards the end of October, invited Professor Rosate to a consultation. Trepanning was proposed, but deferred on account of danger to the patient, who grew so much worse that, about this time, the Viaticum was administered. To render insupportable agony tolerable the hypodermic injections of morphine, ordered some time before, were increased. As early as January, 1890, the doctors were of

¹ Boissarie, *Lourdes, Histoire Médicale*.

opinion that by the employment of no remedy could the invalid ever recover the use of his legs. In June, 1890, an operation for a tumour, one of the incidental consequences of the injury, was performed by Dr. Catani. Oscillating between doubtfully better and undoubtedly worse, the patient reached the spring of 1891. There was now intense irritability of the nervous system, but no sensation in the legs. It was the reiterated opinion of the doctors that the paralysis caused by the *sclerosi a placche* was spreading slowly to all the vital functions, and that the sufferer could not long survive.

Resources of the medical art proving vain, Mr. and Mrs. Campbell decided to have recourse to the Virgin Mary. On the 15th June, 1891, Mrs. Campbell and her daughter began the first of three *neuvaines* to the Madonna of the Rosary of Pompei. But as the *neuvaine* went on the patient grew steadily worse, and to such a degree that on the 22nd June, Dr. Baldwin made a final effort to overcome the invalid's opposition, and urged the immediate trepanning, because, if longer delayed, it would be impossible. Mr. Campbell could now only with difficulty pronounce a few words. No operation, however, was performed. The 23rd June, as also the day before, the sufferer had received injections of morphine three times, to dull the torturing pain in his head and spine. At ten o'clock in the evening the Rosary and the prayers were said for the last day of the first *neuvaine*, and towards twelve o'clock, under the influence of the morphine, Mr. Campbell went to sleep. At five in the morning he waked. Amazed to feel no anguish in his head and back, he believed that he was dreaming, and only convinced himself that the pain had ceased, by pressing on his head and on the nape of his neck, which caused no suffering nor irritation. Nausea had likewise departed, and he asked for something to eat. He tried to get up, but could not use his legs, and the effort caused severe suffering in the spine. The doctors had said that it would be impossible for the patient, even should he get well of the injury, having now the habit, to abstain from morphine; but he gave it up at once and without trouble.

Together Mr. and Mrs. Campbell, with their daughter, began the second *neuvaine*. In the morning of the 2nd July, feast of the Visitation, the day on which the second *neuvaine* ended, while Mrs. Campbell was in church at early Mass, Mr. Campbell waked and felt an impulse to get up and dress. He put his

feet to the floor, arose, dressed himself, and walked. Mrs. Campbell, coming in, was stupefied to see her husband on his feet and dressed. To show her how complete was the cure, he mounted two rather high steps beneath the window and thence leaped into the middle of the room. The next day he ascended without help the long stairs to thank the Cardinal Archbishop of Florence for some favour; also amazed Dr. Baldwin by going up his stairs, carrying in each hand a crutch, which, some time before, the doctor had lent him, and returning them with thanks.

This writer heard the main assertions of the foregoing account confirmed by a most worthy person, not of the "Latin race," but a true British subject, who during a considerable part of his illness, nursed Mr. Campbell, and who saw him two days after his cure. Furthermore they were corroborated by Mr. Campbell himself in the month of October, 1891, at his own house and in the street, where he was seen in excellent health and walking easily and naturally.

A statement, embracing the preceding allegations, signed by Mr. and Mrs. Campbell, by Father Fottrell, Mr. Campbell's confessor, and by two other witnesses, is kept in the private archives of the Cardinal Archbishop of Florence, together with the attestations of Dr. William Baldwin and Dr. Giulio Catani.

Other doctors have seen and told of cures that were beyond their science. Dr. Thorens, physician of the Board of Charities, and Dr. MacGeven, his colleague, both Protestants, reported the cure of their patient, James Tonbridge, who was suffering from caries of the vertebræ, with failing of the spinal column and paralysis of the legs, abscesses and extended sores; his chest also had become affected, and an incessant cough indicated the organic wear which was going on. The patient arrived at Lourdes, August 20, 1879; was carried first to the grotto, then to the pool. There he had a sensation as though a flame traversed his body; an extraordinary force penetrated him; he arose, dressed himself, and walked without support. He had arrived at Lourdes lying in the carriage, unable to make a movement. He went away from there, carrying his bag and rugs, walking with a firm and decided step. On meeting him at his return, his wife fainted, and persons who had seen him depart in a dying condition, and who now saw him free and well, ran after him the whole length of the Avenue de la Reine-

Hortense to satisfy themselves that they were not victims of an illusion.¹

Dr. Constantin James, after having visited and studied the principal thermal stations of Europe, went to Lourdes to form an opinion for himself as to the virtue of its water, and all the marvellous cures of which the report had reached him. He went there, not as a believer, not as a Catholic, but as a physician and scholar. He published in the *Paris Journal* the reasons for a conviction, which has remained with him unshaken ever since. Replying to those that allege that there is nothing extraordinary at Lourdes, except the duplicity successfully practised there and that the maladies there cured are simulated, he says: "Tell me, if you please, how a cancer of the breast is simulated? how an ulceration of the tongue is simulated? how a caries, a necrosis, a white tumour are simulated? All maladies which, according to the latest statements, have been cured at Lourdes. Now if these were real diseases, and they must have been real, their cures ought to be regarded as miracles, since affections of this kind have never been cured spontaneously."²

Before so dogmatically committing himself nothing was easier than for Mr. Hart to know the details of many cures like those here mentioned. It would be childish to deny, without a careful scrutiny, the facts of cases so well attested; hazardous to assert that the subjects were "especially, the fervent and enthusiastic," and so forth; absurd to allege that the diseases were nervous affections, or that their source was in a hysterical disposition. To proclaim at the end, and as a result of, an examination of hypnotic impostures that, "the hypnotic *endormeur* is very well able to explain "these and similar 'faith-cures,'" is clearly a lame and impotent conclusion.

It is not the purpose of this article to dispute the assertion that such things, and even more wonderful, may be done by "suggestion;" it does, however, affirm that such an assertion is incredible on its face; that it is sustained by no proof; and that it is contradicted by respectable and candid men of learning who have given to these matters their special attention.

Why does not Mr. Hart demonstrate the truth of his unqualified and unsustained allegation? For years Lourdes has been, and still is, the very head and front of the startling displays in which he sees signs of so much danger. Its effects

¹ Boissarie, *Lourdes, Histoire Medicale.*

² *Ibid.*

for evil—or for good—reach the limits of civilization. Believers in its pilgrimages are links in a chain of faith, or of folly, which girdles the habitable globe. Its importance, as a centre of this kind of “mental eccentricity,” is to the hypnotic studies and shows at La Charité as Mont Blanc to a mole-hill; as an ocean to the lake of the Bois de Boulogne. Why, then, did not Mr. Hart go to Lourdes and investigate what has happened and is happening there, if he was truly moved by a desire to put an end to the “hysterical excitement” whose consequences he so much apprehends? Why did he not take this bull, this minotaur of superstition, by the horns there, in his den, by the rocks of Massabielle? Why, if he wished to mention a thing so notorious as are the “cures of the grotto,” should he not choose, at least, to speak of it correctly? If the half of what is respectably and positively asserted in regard to unaccountable occurrences at that place had been rumoured concerning the operations of mesmerism, magnetism, hypnotism, spiritism, any ism, any where, the truth would have been sought, the alleged phenomena persistently and profoundly studied, on the spot, by scientific men long ago, and the world would have been informed whether such manifestations were owing to the assigned causes or not.

Instead of pursuing such a course, with reference to the phenomena of Lourdes, Mr. Hart, for some reason, has chosen to assume as facts propositions which are notoriously contested. He has precedent for assuming—if it be true that science has placed among its axioms the dictum: “Laws of nature cannot be subverted; there is no such thing as a miracle.” This, however, is merely a profession of faith, or of no-faith; and not exclusively scientific. An ignorant man may disbelieve as easily and as much; the fool is said to have asserted a hearty incredulity infinitely more sweeping and radical. In each case it has alike no scientific value. To treat this confession of unbelief as an axiom is a fallacious begging of the question. Its truth must be demonstrated; but its truth cannot be demonstrated; and until its truth is demonstrated it cannot be laid down as a fundamental principle. For scientific men, professed investigators, avowed searchers after truth, to screen themselves behind such a pretended axiom to avoid, with apparent decency, examining the facts of alleged miracles, is not creditable to their courage nor to their candour. A fact does not cease to be a fact when, with more or less authority,

it is called miraculous. The concurrence of voices, so to name it, is rather an evidence that the fact is rare, remarkable, worthy of observation. It would seem as if science also assumed that a novel fact may lose its novelty, an abnormal fact its anomaly, an inexplicable fact its inscrutability simply by being called miraculous, so as no longer to have any interest for the philosopher or the investigator. And it would seem also as if it were necessary gravely to argue that the facts seen at La Charité would have been the same had the director advertised them as supernaturally produced; and that the more enigmatic, the more incomprehensible a phenomenon, the wider the belief in its supernatural cause, the greater is the opportunity for science to investigate, to seek an explanation, to make evident the existence and operations of occult natural causes.

Too many inconsiderate people lightly attribute any surprising event, of which the source is hidden or unknown, to a miraculous agency, as though things of import so tremendous were ordinary incidents of everyday life, and thus, in unreflecting minds, throw discredit on the doctrine of miracles and also on even strongly vouched reports of wholly abnormal facts. But philosophers, men of science, and men of free thought, should be above the reach of such influences. It would be no more illogical to conclude that there were no diseases of a certain sort because some persons simulate them, than it is to treat as fiction the facts of alleged miracles because the same class of persons may attempt to counterfeit them. Of the interpretation of these facts nothing is here said.

Mr. Hart's implied assertion that "faith-curers" have been "infecting the public mind with the follies of the "new hypnotism," the "profound hypnosis," the "new mesmerism," the "magnetization of hypnotics," the "externalization of sensation;" his limitation of the benefits of faith-cure; and his positive endorsement of the *endormeur's* explanation of it, when exhibited side by side with the record of facts here adduced, make plain the grave and lamentable errors into which, although writing as an instructor, he has imprudently permitted himself to fall. It may be expected of his good faith that he will retract much that he has eagerly volunteered to say; will modify much; and that he will admit concerning faith-cures, that, after all which is said by those who are too ready to cry miracle! miracle! is swept away, after all the decorations of fancy are removed, after all the exaggerations

of zeal are amputated, there remains a residuum of pure fact well worth testing, scrutinizing, analyzing. He cannot afford longer disdainfully or indifferently to ignore them. However strange these phenomena, he is persuaded, assured, in his own mind, that they are produced by natural causes, and therefore subject to natural tests. Let him exercise his ingenuity in devising and applying such tests till he shall be able to say, from his own experiments, what is the demonstrated and the demonstrable explanation of them, or that, in the present condition of human knowledge, they are inexplicable. Let him do it with the spirit and the candour of science for science's sake. Let him do it in the name of that fairness which is the boast of Englishmen. Let him do it out of respect to the two hundred millions and more believers in and witnesses to the faith-cures of Lourdes, among whom have been and are some of the profoundest and best ordered intellects, even in England; whose words should surely not be treated like the idle babble of fools, the gabble of "mentally disordered creatures," or the ravings of madmen. Let him do it to gratify philosophers, free-thinkers, fair-minded and just men to whom this question is interesting, and who would welcome a convincing solution. Since it must be evident to any one who reads the records here cited, which, with many others like unto them, are elsewhere preserved, that the facts of Lourdes obtrude themselves; that they are too weighty to be blown away by aspirations of those who say poh! poh!

Plainly, Mr. Hart counts a belief in modern miracles as one of the "new superstitions;" consequently those who indulge this belief are, in his judgment, superstitious. But there are no indications from which to infer how that gentleman would designate the "mental disorder" of professed truth-seekers who, without the pretence of an examination, without even condescending to obtain correct general information, deny well-attested facts; regard such as those presented in this article as common, not out of the ordinary course of human experience, in no way remarkable, surely not phenomenal, because to them is attached the word miraculous; dispute, with more or less show of contempt, the characterization given by men who have conscientiously studied such facts; oracularly assign to a convenient misrepresentation of them a causation having no basis other than their own random guesses, no authority not thence derived. Is the disorder of these persons, instead of a weak

and pliable credulity, a weakly obstinate incredulity? It cannot be honest scepticism; for the characteristic of that "is to come to no conclusion, for or against." Is it better, stronger, more liberal, more candid, more enlightened, more truth-loving than the "superstition" by which the soul of Mr. Hart is so much grieved and alarmed? Would he call it bigotry? Certainly it answers well enough to the definition of that mental condition. But bigotry is even less amiable than superstition.

Clearly, the instantaneous renewal of corrupted and separated bone, of consumed and suppurating flesh, as in the case of Pierre de Rudder, for instance; the filling of caverns in a consumptive's lungs, the replacing of morbid by healthy tissues, as if the cause had said: "Let the invalid be *made* whole, and the invalid was *made* whole from that very hour;" all these have the character of effects produced by something possessing the power to make, to create. Unless Mr. Hart can show that this is not a well-grounded inference, he certainly will not venture to proclaim what appears to be equivalent to an affirmation that the hypnotic *endormeur* has discovered the secret of creation and wherein its strength lieth—namely, in "self-suggestion or suggestion from without."

Does this same *endormeur's* elucidation of the "miracles of faith-cure and pilgrimage" appear so "accurate" to this investigator that he cannot apprehend, nor even conceive, the possibility of its being discredited through the discovery by science of some other more probable, more demonstrable explanation? And if, after all, it should be established—the hypothesis may, with permission, be stated—that no explanation of some at least of these phenomena by causes within the limits of natural law, will bear the test of rigid scientific scrutiny, would not the imprudently prompt and positive expounder as well as the "hypnotic *endormeur*" be confounded?

It would seem as though such possibilities, dim and remote as they may look, might furnish motives strong enough to induce science to go slowly and with circumspection; to scrutinize surely and exhaustively; to refrain from dogmatically enunciating hasty inferences or crude guesses as ultimate truths; and to abstain from proclaiming even an apparently well-grounded conclusion till, by processes of the most careful and scrupulous investigation, its correctness should be demonstrably established.

Two years before Mr. Hart wrote an account of his visit to

La Charité, and the results thereof, for the *Nineteenth Century*, he might have read, in a book published at Paris, words of which a translation follows :

What will our successors think of the action of medicaments at a distance? of the phenomena of transfer? of the magnet's power? At the hospital of La Charité we see every day two or three subjects, admirably trained, take for their account the infirmities of numerous patients who come and try to free themselves of their ills.

In the middle ages they hardly did better; the miracles of La Charité recall the cures of the cemetery Saint Medard.¹

The author of these words is a physician, a student, liberal and conscientious, a frank examiner of marvellous things, a scrupulous investigator of the "startling displays" at Lourdes, who says of them: "I have seen cures which could receive no scientific interpretation, and what I have seen, fifty, a hundred doctors have seen like me."

Before making this assertion he studied during four years the surprising phenomena at Lourdes. Then he wrote a book, by which he published the facts and reasons on which the assertion is grounded.

Mr. Hart, before publishing his *ipse dixit*, that these same cures can receive an accurate interpretation from the hypnotic *endormeur*, studied during two weeks the hypnotic performances at the Charité Hospital in Paris.

It would have been more generous on his part had Mr. Hart, according to scientific practice, clearly defined a "pathological" creature. In the absence of such definition, the unscientific reader is naturally puzzled. His dictionary only tells him that "pathological" means "pertaining to pathology;" and that pathology is "that branch of medicine which treats of the nature and differences of diseases, their causes, symptoms, and effects; the doctrine of diseases." It is not wonderful that an unlearned person finds difficulty in applying this adjective intelligibly to a creature. Mr. Hart's evident desire to instruct, the well-known candour of science, the fact that it never takes anything for granted, its exactness in the use of terms, its love of truth for truth's sake and indifference to its consequences, make noticeable the fact that here the man of science employed a term which to the great majority of his readers does not convey any clear signification, and in some other places has forgotten himself.

¹ Boissarie, *Lourdes, Histoire Médicale*.

Christ in Modern Theology.

VI.

WHEN we hear it said that a man is very "critical," the epithet may have meanings which lie anywhere between the praise of exercising a sound judgment and the blame of being most unreasonably a grumbler at anything that happens to arouse his dislike. We were going to call this latter characteristic, "fault-finding," but we forbore, because in its literal sense the term does not convey our thought, since faults properly to be found must really exist, and we wished to speak of those ungrounded complaints which so often pass under the name of "criticisms." Criticism, in the proper sense, will sometimes have to be hostile, at other times it ought to be favourable, being under no necessity from its own nature, as is occasionally half supposed, to limit itself to condemnations. In dealing at a length, which unfortunately has been protracted to wearisomeness, with a compendium of Patristic doctrine on the subject of sacerdotalism, as it comes from the pen of Principal Fairbairn, we have at least endeavoured to be in the better sense critical, that is, to produce the words of the authors to whom appeal has been made and to see whether their testimony truly is what it has been declared to be. There remain for us only two more Fathers whose doctrine we have to discuss: then we shall have followed the Principal over the whole of the plot of ground upon which we undertook to test his measurements. Here, then, are the utterances of his, which are the last we shall "criticize": "To Justin Martyr, Christians were the true high-priestly race: they offered the sacrifices well-pleasing to God, the prayer and thanksgiving which He loves to accept, when offered by the worthy.¹ With Irenæus the sacerdotal dignity is the portion of the just, and the sanctified heart, the holy life, faith, obedience, righteousness, are the sacrifices God loves.² The

¹ *Dial.* 116, 117; *Apol.* i. 13, 67.

² *Heres.* iv. 8, § 3; 17, § 4; v. 34, § 3.

choicest altar was the service of the needy : to minister to man was to sacrifice to God."¹ We have to show that such an analysis, which is meant to carry an anti-sacerdotal force, is not justifiable on inspection, because there is no intended exclusion of the peculiar priesthood by the general, of ritual sacrifice by non-ritual, of external form by inner spirit, of good use by condemned abuse.

St. Justin speaks of the Holy Eucharist in his first *Apology* and in his *Dialogue*; perhaps in the former work more collectedly and of set purpose, in the latter more interruptedly and casually. Further comparison shows a distinction of higher importance, namely, that in the *Apology* the sacrificial character is not, while in the *Dialogue* it is, expressly treated. The reason why, in the address presented to the pagan Emperors, chiefly the Supper as a religious meal should be dwelt upon, was because the practice of celebrating an unholy banquet was one of the stock accusations against the Christians, brought, be it observed, by the heathens, who among their own fables had stories of the same horrible character as they fancied they had detected in the rites of the new religion. The names of Pelops and Thyestes will recur to the memory. As a fact, some so-called Christians are reported to have indulged in excesses of the kind reprobated; but these were really sectaries, gnostics or contemners of the material creation, who in the extravagance of their theories about purity came to feign that the higher nature was above contamination from the lower, and so might sport with its impurities, as Luther sometimes did with the devil and his suggestions. Such fanatics brought reproach on the name of Christian, which they falsely bore, doing, perhaps (but St. Justin leaves the question unsettled)² "unspeakable deeds of sin, upsetting the lamps at night to hold promiscuous intercourse under cover of darkness, and feasting on human flesh." In the second *Apology*³ he speaks more fully of a charge which he stigmatizes as a calumny, to the effect "that we kill a man and, drinking copiously of his blood, imitate a ceremony of your own." Against the pagan mysteries it is possible that the Christians have made more charges than they could have substantiated, while other alleged practices were demonstrable enough and wicked more than enough. A secret rite always runs the risk of being unfairly suspected and denounced by outsiders, who go on the fallacious syllogism

¹ P. 103.² *Apol.* i. 26.³ *Apol.* ii. 12.

which has what logicians call the fault of "the undistributed middle:" Wickedness shuns the light: These ceremonies shun the light: Therefore these ceremonies are wicked. If once it had leaked out that Christians eat the flesh and drank the blood of their God, it was inevitable that the mistake of the Capharnaïtes should not be repeated, and that a Supper, very holy in itself, should not be taxed with grossness.¹ But we cannot straightway condemn the secrecy which led to the mis-interpretation, for it may even have been enjoined by words which Clement of Alexandria and later writers attribute to our Lord: "My mystery is for Me and for those that are Mine;"² at any rate the concealment which was not to hide guilt but reverently to shroud what the public could not understand, had the full sanction of authority. St. Justin, however, thought that he was called upon in part to break through the generally observed silence and to speak openly of the Eucharist as a Sacred Banquet in which there was no blame.

Having thus explained how the first *Apology* has little to say of the Sacrifice as such, we will proceed to weigh the force of what it does say, having first protested that, for reasons which we have already given more than once, there is no prejudice done to the sacerdotal cause in chapter 10, where it is said that God has no need of a "material oblation" (*ὕλικῆς προσφορᾶς*):³

¹ "Atrocious calumnies against the Christians were the consequence of accumulated hatreds. It was about this time that rumours, which up to then had no particular force, assumed a definite form and became a rooted opinion. The mystery attaching to the Christian reunions, the mutual affection which reigned in the Church, gave birth to the most foolish notions. They were supposed to form a secret society, to have secrets known only to the initiated, to be guilty of shameful promiscuity and of lives contrary to nature. Some spoke of the adoration of a God with the head of an ass, others of the ignoble homage rendered to the priest. One story which received general currency was this: They presented to the person who was being initiated an infant covered over with paste, in order to train his hand by degrees to murder. The novice struck, the blood poured forth, they divided the trembling limbs, and cemented thus their alliance through complicity, and bound themselves to absolute silence. Then they became drunk, lights were extinguished, and in the darkness they gave themselves up to the most hideous vice. Rome was always a city much given to slander: a multitude of newsmongers and gossips were on the watch for *bizarre* tales. The serious part about it was this, that in the legal proceedings to which those accusations gave rise, they put to the question slaves belonging to the Christian houses—women, young boys—who, overcome by the tortures, said all that was wished of them." (Renan, *Origins of Christianity*, bk. vi. p. 258.)

² Cf. St. Mark iv. 11.

³ Pagans made it a theme of their declamation that the gods stood in no need of gifts from men; see a passage referred to Apollonius of Tyana by Eusebius (*Præp. Evangel.* iv. 13) and the 95th Epistle of Seneca, in which, after his well-known denunciations of luxury in the Romans, he says: "Proponamus oportet finem

no defender of the priesthood rests his case on such need, any more than he grounds the obligation of the prayer of petition on God's need to be told of our wants before He knows them and can give relief. To take up, then, without further preliminary the passages bearing on our subject, we find the *Apology* following an order found also in the *Didache*. As the latter treats of Baptism in chapter 7, of the prayers for Holy Communion in chapters 9 and 10, and of the Sunday Service, which we claim to recognize as our Mass, in chapter 14, so the former work treats of Baptism in chapter 61, of the Mass of the faithful, to which persons were not admitted till after their Baptism, in chapters 65 and 66, after which follows in chapter 67 the account of the Sunday Service, which mentions, in addition, the part of the Mass at which we know that catechumens and penitents were allowed to be present. These several testimonies we will now adduce to see whether they are anti-sacerdotal, as Principal Fairbairn supposes them to be.

Opening the *Apology* at chapter 61, we read how those who have accepted the Catholic faith and have promised to live conformably to its requirements, after prayer, fasting, and repentance, are brought to the waters of "regeneration" and "illumination," where they are baptized in the name of the Blessed Trinity. Baptism here appears as more than a human institution, more than a mere symbol; as a rite handed down by the Apostles from their Master, whose teaching was, "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Such language at least fits in well with sacerdotal ideas. Next, in chapters

summi boni ad quem nitamur, ad quem omne factum nostrum dictumque respiciat veluti navigantibus ad aliquod sidus dirigendus est cursus. Vita sine proposito vaga est. Quod si utique proponendum est, incipiunt necessaria esse decreta. Illud, puto, concedes, nihil esse turpius dubio, pedem modo referente, modo producente. Quomodo sint dii colendi solet præcipi. Accendere aliquam lucernam sabbatis prohibeamus, quoniam nec lumine dii egent nec homines quidem delectantur fulgine. Vetemus salutationibus matutinis fungi, et foribus assidere templorum; humana ambitio istis officiis capitur. Deum colet qui novit. Vetemus lintea et strigiles Jovi ferre, et speculum teneri Junoni. Non quærit ministros Deus. Quidni? ipse humano generi ministrat; ubique et omnibus præsto est. Audiatur licet quemadmodum se gerere in sacrificiis debeat, quam procul resilire a molestiis ac superstitionibus; nunquam satis perfectum erit, nisi qualem debet Deum mente conceperit, omnia habentem, omnia tribuentem, beneficia gratis dantem. Primus est deorum cultus deos credere; deinde reddere illis majestatem suam, reddere bonitatem sine qua nulla majestas est. Vis deos propitiare? bonus esto: Satis illos coluit quisquis imitatus est." Here Seneca has seized some of the truth, but not all.

65, 66, we find the transition made from the initiatory sacrament of the Christian religion to a higher, and indeed the highest, though not the most necessary, rite of the Christian Church. We see the newly-baptized neophytes allowed to be present for the first time at a prayer recited in the Eucharistic service after the Homily, and then at the subsequent portions of the Mass: namely, at the kiss of peace, which in the Eastern ritual usually came thus early, though in parts of the West it was delayed till just before the Communion; at the offering by the faithful of bread and wine mingled with water as the matter for the Sacrifice in the hands of the chief celebrant; at various prayers said by him, one of which was specially called Eucharistic; at the Amen uttered by the people on the conclusion of the prayers; at the distribution of the consecrated elements to all present by the deacons, who also carried away a share of the Blessed Sacrament to absent members. "After we have washed with the waters of Baptism the candidate who has professed his faith and has assented to our doctrines, we conduct him to the assembly of the brethren, as they are called, in order to make supplications in common for ourselves and for him who has just been illumined, as also for all others wherever they are, that having attained the knowledge of truth we may have the grace, through right conduct and the observance of the precepts, to secure our eternal salvation. At the end of our prayer we exchange the kiss of peace: and then to him who presides (*τῷ προεστῶτι*) is offered the bread and the wine mixed with water which the brethren have provided; and he taking the gifts renders praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, making long thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστίαν*) for the gifts which he has received. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, then the people answer with acclamation, Amen, which in the Hebrew language means *So be it.*" Next, "the ministers called by us deacons give to each one present a portion of the Eucharistic bread (*τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος*) and of the wine mingled with water, and they carry Communion to those absent." In the above extract we claim to recognize in the "President," the Bishop, on the strength of what we know from other sources, and because with him are associated the well-known assistants of the Bishop, the deacons, who are put into contrast with the *λαός*, the people or laity. It is true that the words of consecration are not in this chapter,

as they are in the next, specially mentioned, for the main purpose is to describe the Communion of the newly baptized; and when they are said to receive "bread and wine," it cannot be argued that a denial of transubstantiation is deducible from the words, for we who believe in this change still speak exactly as does St. Justin, who immediately afterwards adds the remark that he is not talking of common food.¹ "This food," he continues, "is called among us the Eucharist, of which he only is allowed to participate who believes our doctrine, and has been washed in the waters of our Baptism unto the remission of his sins and unto his regeneration, and whose life is in conformity with what Christ has taught. For it is not as common bread or as common drink that we receive these things; but in like manner as, by the power of God's Word, Jesus Christ, our Saviour, becoming incarnate, took upon Him our flesh and blood for our salvation, so we learn that the food which by His word² of prayer has been consecrated into the Eucharist (τὴν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν), and by which our flesh and blood receives a transforming nourishment (κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται), is the very Body and Blood of Jesus Himself Incarnate. For the Apostles in the memoirs that have reached us from them, which we call the Gospels, have handed it down that such was the command of Jesus when taking bread and giving thanks, He said, *Do this in commemoration of Me; This is My Body*; and similarly taking the chalice and giving thanks, He said, *This is My Blood*. Moreover, we are informed that it was to the Apostles alone He communicated these gifts." It may be urged that there is here no open assertion of transubstantiation, inasmuch as κατὰ μεταβολήν³ cannot be proved to bear that sense; but at any rate, we are told that the Sacrament is so holy as to require from the recipient faith and innocence; that it is no ordinary

¹ Exactly so St. Irenæus: "The earthly bread, having God invoked upon it, is no longer common bread." (iv. 18.)

² The Fathers are very uniform in their way of saying that the words effect the consecration; besides the above passage from St. Justin, who before had used the same expression: λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πάντων (c. 13). we have in Origen, *Contra Cels.* viii. 33, σῶμα γινόμενος ἄρτος διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐγινόν τι; and St. Irenæus, iv. 18, n. 4, ἄρτος προσλαβόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is because of the "word" pronounced over the bread that it ceases to be, according to SS. Justin and Irenæus, "common bread."

³ Harnack, who admits that St. Justin here teaches the Real Presence, comments on the passage thus: "κατὰ μεταβολήν, that is, this holy food, like other food, is to be converted into our flesh; but it is very probable that here Justin has in his mind the body of the resurrection. The form of expression is chosen, as the context shows, to signify the parallel with the Incarnation." (*Dogmengeschichte*, band. i. s. 154.)

food; that the entrance of the Son of God into the elements may be paralleled with His entrance into human flesh at the Incarnation, and is effected by that power of omnipotence, "the Word of God"—a sacramental word, answering to the description of St. Augustine, *accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*; ¹ that the food so consecrated has a transforming effect upon the body, according to the promise of our Lord that it should undo the destructive power of death by providing a glorious resurrection; ² that the Sacred Mysteries were first communicated to the Apostles alone, so that to them peculiarly was addressed the command, *Do in commemoration of Me* that which is brought about by the utterance of the words, *This is My Body, this is My Blood*, the direct unqualified signification of which, if we take this to be the one intended, exactly corresponds to Catholic belief on the subject. Indeed, from our examination so far of St. Justin's outline, the fitness of his language to express our own creed is what is specially remarkable: and though he might have gone further and more undisputably have pledged himself to our formularies, yet that he should have done so was not to be expected when he was addressing an Emperor who would not have entered into the abstruser details, and who was being favoured with information not usually given to a pagan, even in the general terms which St. Justin employs to defend his brethren from having their holiest act of worship misconstrued into a most unholy practice.

In chapter 67 there follows the description of the Sunday Service: and whereas before, in the sketch of the Mass, the part of it attended by catechumens was omitted, now it is inserted, and we have related to us the familiar order of incidents; the Lectures from Old and New Testament, the Homily, the prayers said by all in common (the kiss of peace being passed by in silence this time), the oblation of bread and of wine mixed with water, the Eucharistic and other prayers said by the Bishop, to which the people (*λαός*) answer, Amen, the Communion given to all assisting at the ceremony and taken to the absent by the deacons. Alms also are collected to be distributed to the needy. "Faithful to our Lord's command, we have ever since His day recalled one to another His memory; those of us who possess means give to those who are needy, and we always keep united together. Moreover, in every

¹ Tractat. 80, *In Joan.* n. 3.

² St. John vi.

oblation of ours we praise the Maker of all things through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Ghost. On the day called Sunday all assemble from town and country in one place (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, according as time allows. When the reader has ceased, the President (Bishop), by words of admonition and exhortation, urges us to follow the bright examples that have been put before us. Next we all stand up and offer prayers, at the conclusion of which bread is brought, as also wine and water; and the President, with all the energy at his command,¹ offers prayers and thanksgiving, to which the people answer with acclaim, Amen. Each then is given to participate of the consecrated elements, which are also carried by the deacons to the absent." The words of consecration here omitted, are supplied in an earlier chapter which we have already examined. One thing at any rate is evident, that if St. Justin's description of the Sunday Service as it was in his day, be applied to the Sunday Service in any Cathedral of our day at which a Catholic Bishop is officiating, the only differences we shall note are unimportant in doctrinal significance, such as that nowadays no prayer is uttered aloud by all the assembly; that the kiss of peace is deferred till near the Communion-time, and then is exchanged only between a few; that the bread with the wine and the water of the Sacrifice is not provided, as it were on the spot, by the congregation, and that deacons do not distribute the sacred elements to the communicants. But in essentials our Mass may be described by the words of the great Apologist; and, what is more, we have a constant series of documents and monuments witnessing to the oneness of the rite all along the Christian ages.

Exchanging the *Apology* for the *Dialogue*, we are now to examine how St. Justin treats the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, and how much truth there is in Harnack's assertion about him, that he "recognizes in the bread the actual Flesh of Christ, but does not find therein the idea of a sacrifice." It is a long way on to sacerdotalism thus to admit a rite in which a Real Presence of Christ, under the form of bread, is produced: and when besides it is evident beyond the possibility of a serious

¹ ὅση δύναμις αὐτοῦ. From the words, compared with a passage in the *Didache* (x. 7), some chose to infer that the Bishop was not limited to the words in the ritual. Our translation does not suppose that theory.

dispute that St. Justin regards the Eucharist as in some way a sacrifice, much has been provided for enforcing the Catholic interpretation. In the *Dialogue* the discourse is no longer with a pagan Emperor, whose idea of sacrifice was so hopelessly, and to himself so misleadingly, wide of the mark, but with a Jew who ought to have been prepared for a more spiritual understanding of things, if indeed he had read his own Bible with intelligence. And intelligence would have told him that what was denounced in the sacrifices of the Old Law was not the rite itself, when performed in its proper spirit, but the defects of the individual offerers. True, it is said, "because of the sins of the people and because of their idolatries, God commanded sacrifices to be made;"¹ but thereby it is not implied that they could not have been ordered, and were not, as one of the reasons for them, ordered on account of the positive honour which they did to God, any more than it is implied, by the exhortations of the Fathers to fast in order to spare what may be given in alms to the poor, that fasting had no direct purposes of its own. Only as part of His whole intention "God commanded victims to be offered to Him, lest you should worship idols." He had also in view, as a noble end, the typical connexion with the Sacrifice of the Cross, on account of which mainly the oblations of the Old Law had a sanctifying virtue and a power of giving glory to the Creator. St. Justin's approval and his condemnation of sacrifice as practised by the Jews of old, correspond to what Scripture says respectively on the same two ends, and his reprobatory part is borrowed from the well-known denunciations, made by the Prophets Amos² and Jeremias.³ As a result of modern theory concerning the post-exilic origin of the priestly code, we are now, as compared with past generations, at a disadvantage in arguing from the Old Law to the New, on behalf of sacerdotalism. The existence of an exclusive priesthood, its unique powers, its right to centralize worship at one sanctuary, are attributed by modern theorists to an encroachment of a self-interested class on the primitive liberty, spontaneity, and self-sufficiency of the people. We are aware of the additional obstacle put on our path; but it is not our work to set about removing it here, for at least St. Justin had no conception of it, and what he thought of sacrifices, Jewish and Christian, is the only question which concerns us at present. Now with respect to the abolition by Christ of circumcision and other rites, he thus

¹ *Dial.* 22.

² Amos v. 21—vi. 6.

³ Jerem. vii. 21, 22.

discourses :¹ "I will bring forward to you, my friends, the words of God Himself, which He spoke to His people through Malachy, one of the twelve Prophets : *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and your sacrifices I will not receive at your hands ; for from the rising to the setting sun, My Name shall be glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place a sacrifice shall be offered in My Name, and the sacrifice shall be pure ; because My Name is honoured among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, but you have dishonoured it.* And through David He spoke, *A people that I have not known shall serve Me ; in the hearing of the ear it shall obey Me.*" The same strain is continued :² "Let us Gentiles, gathered together, glorify God because He has looked down upon us favourably : let us glorify Him through the King of glory, through the Lord of the powers. For He is well disposed towards the Gentiles, and receives sacrifices more agreeably from us than from you (the Jews). What need have I of circumcision, I who am approved by God's own witness ? what need is there of such a baptism for one who is baptized in the Holy Ghost ?" In chapter 41, the comparison of old and new rites is further pursued to bring out the typical relationship and the contrast. "The oblation of fine flour, which had to be offered for those who were being cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to offer (*ποιεῖν*) in memory of what He suffered for the cleansing of the souls of men from all sinfulness, and at the same time in thanksgiving to God, for that He has created the world and all things therein for the benefit of man, while He has also freed us from the guilt in which we were held captive, and through Him who, in obedience to the Father's will, underwent His Passion, has completely released us from the tyranny of principalities and powers. Therefore concerning the sacrifices which of old you were wont to offer, God, as I before noted, says by the mouth of Malachy, one of the twelve Prophets, *I have no pleasure in you, &c.*³ As regards, however, the sacrifices which in every place are offered by us Gentiles, that is, as regards the Eucharistic bread and the Eucharistic chalice, God had already predicted them, adding besides the facts of the glorification of His Name by us, and its profanation by you." Since the types were truly sacrifices, it cannot but be that the antitypes, which St. Justin teaches to be our Eucharistic sacrifices, are also truly sacrificial in character, having the

¹ Dial. 28.² C. 29.³ Ut supra.

bishops for chief priests upon earth, and the laity as co-operators in their degree. "That I may render you an account¹ of the revelation made by Jesus Christ the Holy One, I resume my discourse and affirm that this revelation was vouchsafed to us who believe in Jesus Christ the High Priest, and in Him crucified,—to us who before were involved in impurities of all kinds, but now through the grace of Christ given us by the will of the Father, have put away all the uncleanness that wrapped us round like a garment. . . . We, as one man, through the name of Jesus, trusting in God the Creator of all things, and in the name of His first-born Son, have cast aside our soiled garments, that is, our sins, and fired by the voice of His call, have become the true high-priestly people of God, as God Himself testifies when He says, that in every place among the Gentiles there shall be offered to Him sacrifices well-pleasing and pure. But from none except His priests does He receive sacrifices." As in the Old Law the only priests, strictly so-called, were the sons of Aaron, while all the people were a priestly race offering sacrifice conjointly with their appointed ministers, similarly in the New Law, priests and priestly people combine in one action but with different degrees, not co-ordinately. "Those therefore² who in His Name offer the oblations prescribed by Jesus Christ, that is, the Eucharistic bread and wine which Christians all over the earth celebrate, are pronounced pleasing to God according to His own declaration prophetically uttered. But the oblations made by you (the Jews) He rejects when He says, *Your sacrifices I will not receive at your hands*. Heretofore, in your love of contending for your own point, you have maintained the explanation to be that God does not accept the sacrifices offered at Jerusalem by those who there are called Israelites, while He does hold as pleasing to Him the prayers of those who live in dispersion and calls them sacrifices. I also affirm that the prayers and thanksgivings³ of worthy worshippers are the only perfect and well-pleasing sacrifices to God. These are the only ones that Christians have been taught by tradition to make, and they are called to mind by the memorial of the Food, in form both of meat and drink, wherein there is a commemoration of the Passion which Christ endured for His followers. . . . As concerns,

¹ C. 116. ² C. 117.

³ καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, names which may designate nearly every part of the Mass.

however, the error of yourselves and of your teachers when you interpret Scripture to mean that the members of your race in dispersion are they who in every place offer the pure and acceptable sacrifices, know that you are practising deceit and are trying to beguile yourselves completely ; for, first of all, not even now are you diffused all over the earth from the rising to the setting sun, since there are people to be found among whom men of your race have not fixed a dwelling. Whereas there is no people, whether Greek or barbarian, none by whatever name its members be called, whether they be styled dwellers in waggons, or be dwellingless, whether or not they be tribes living in tents and feeding flocks, there are none among whom, through the name of Jesus crucified, prayers and Eucharistic oblations (εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι) are not presented to the Father and Maker of all things. Moreover, at the time when Malachy* prophesied, you were not dispersed into all the lands in which you now are to be found, a fact demonstrable from the Scriptures."

Such are the passages which we have to adduce from the *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*: and after acknowledging the hyperbole about the universal diffusion of Christianity, a hyperbole used also by Tertullian, with no more than a rhetorical degree of truth, and furthermore, after protesting that the priesthood of all Christians does not negative the peculiar priesthood of some, and that the sacrifices which are to be recognized in the prayers and thanksgivings of the people united to their priests do not negative the specific sacrifice of a priesthood strictly so-called, we invite attention to some points telling strongly for our cause. To begin with, the place once occupied by sacrifice in the Old Law is acknowledged as legitimate, and St. Justin teaches that this place has been since the days of Christ, by His appointment, yielded up to the everywhere prevailing Sacrifice of the Christian Church, which consists in the Eucharistic oblation of bread and wine. In it the people participate by the closest union with their priests, so as to have a share, a subordinate share, in the priestly character themselves ; but that a layman, without being sacramentally ordained to the office, could become "president" at the Sunday Sacrifice, is nowhere hinted at by him, though at the same time he must be acknowledged not explicitly, in so many words, to state the contrary. Speaking to the Emperor apologetically he would have wasted words, and

travelled beyond his limited purpose of proving that the Eucharist was not a wicked banquet, if he had gone off into anything like an exhaustive statement of the privileges of the priesthood: speaking to the Jew he had an auditor who already was familiar with those privileges and needed no telling afresh that "not every one takes to himself the honour, but he who is called by God, like Aaron."¹ It was reserved for those who called themselves Reformers to break away in multitudes from the continuous tradition of Judaism and Christianity; and on them accordingly, not on us, rests the burden of proof when St. Justin's word is to be interpreted. We simply read him in the light of the system to which he belongs, and so read he fits in admirably with our conceptions of him; Principal Fairbairn and those who share his method take St. Justin out of his place in the line of Fathers and theologians, out of his harmony with liturgies and ecclesiastical monuments, and place him in surroundings into which he can be made to fit only by assigning to him negations and affirmations which are not to be found in his works, nor yet in the collateral aids to the interpretation. How opponents of the Catholic rendering of St. Justin bear the *onus probandi* which rests upon their shoulders, Principal Fairbairn does not tell us, for he systematically omits to prove the propositions of his wide-sweeping volume; but we have in Semisch an unusually careful defender of the Protestant view, who has the distinction that he assigns the grounds of his conclusions. Therefore we will examine this argument in default of any propounded by our author.

Semisch, then, prefaces the substantial part of this criticism by the remark that the ancient Church was practical rather than speculative in regard to the Eucharistic doctrine, and did not press points of deeper investigation. His own view² is that the Sacrifice of the Mass was an idea that gradually arose out of the presentation by the faithful of the bread and the wine for the ceremony, an offering which suggested that the ordinance was sacrificial. As to St. Justin himself, however, Semisch thinks that he does not pronounce decidedly in favour of any of the creeds which to-day, in rivalry, lay claim to his support. A few brief headings will show the value of the contention and give opportunity for indicating the methods of reply by which we may meet our adversary.

¹ Hebrews v. 4.

² *St. Justin, Martyr.* By C. Semisch. English Translation, pp. 337, seq.

(a) *In chapter 66 of the Dialogue, while using language which declares some sort of Real Presence, St. Justin neither affirms transubstantiation, nor clearly identifies the Body of Christ as contained in the Eucharist with the Body born of the Virgin Mary and raised from death.*

It is obvious to answer that a Father, not giving a full treatise for students, but only a sketch for outsiders, who rarely were allowed to hear the subject mentioned, may very well have omitted to state the mode of Christ's presence, whether it were by transubstantiation, impanation, companation, or some other conceivable way. As regards, however, the identity of the Body, it is sufficiently implied when Semisch admits that, in St. Justin's words, "no mere symbolic relation of the elements to the Body and the Blood of Christ is ever mentioned, but exactly the opposite is clearly expressed in the assertion that the bread and wine of the Supper, instead of being common bread and common wine, are the Body and Blood of Christ," a view in which Harnack agrees; and again, that St. Justin "unquestionably maintains a Real Presence of Christ in the Supper," and "affirms distinctly that the bread and wine are the very Flesh and Blood of Christ." In fact, it is the merest confusion of thought to fancy Christ really present with any other body except His own, which must be one and the same in substance, though not in appearances, wherever it is. Christ has only one Body, which either is or is not really present in any assigned place.

(b) *From the comparison which St. Justin makes between the Word taking flesh of Mary and Christ taking up His abode in the elements of the Eucharist, we should infer no physical alteration of the bread and the wine, but a consecration of them, whereby they become "the vehicle, as it were, in which the Logos dwells," so that they "are actually, though in a sense only figuratively, the Body and the Blood of the Logos."*

Our complaint against this argument is its extreme vagueness; it cannot pretend that St. Justin supposed an exact parallel between the Incarnation and the Eucharist; it hides itself in a cloud when it talks indefinitely of "a vehicle, as it were," and of a presence "actual, though in a sense only figurative," without any attempt to state the application of the two senses. We, on the contrary, commit ourselves plainly to the doctrine that the Real Presence of Christ is also figurative, inasmuch as it is sacramentally veiled, and so points back

to a once visible appearance on earth, but more especially points forward to a visible appearance in Heaven, where faith and grace will give room to sight and glory.

(c) We have finished with what Semisch has to object against St. Justin's testimony as quoted in favour of the Catholic dogma of the Sacrament, and, coming next to what he has to say about the Sacrifice, we find him so confused that we cannot pretend to formulate his difficulty in a single sentence: we must, therefore, take him piecemeal. And, as preliminaries, we make the two remarks—first, that, for reasons before given, we demur to the inference from St. Justin's admission of the priesthood, common to all Christians, that the Saint denies a special priesthood, confined to a comparative few; and second, that because he separates his subject, speaking rather of the Sacrament in the *Apology* and of the Sacrifice in the *Dialogue*, he consequently implies that the essence of the Sacrifice cannot be in the mode of Christ's presence within the symbols, but must be rather in the acts of the offerers, who use the elements as symbols of their inner disposition. It is further noticeable that, by way of hypothesis, Semisch undertakes to conduct his argument, while waiving the question of a special priesthood and of the mode of the Real Presence. So much to prepare the way: now we come to observe three substantial blunders.

(i.) Semisch is under some sort of delusion that Catholics need to find in St. Justin a writer who places the Sacrifice in the part of the Mass known as the Communion, which is received alike by the ministers and by the people. This we gather from an utterance like the following: "There is not the slightest intimation that the bread and the wine were consecrated in order that, *after the consequent transformation*, they might serve as the materials of an unbloody sacrifice." Just as we should have suspected, *a priori*, Semisch never shows a sign that in trying to prove St. Justin adverse to the Catholic dogma of the Mass he has ever consulted Catholic theologians to find out wherein they consider the essence of the Sacrifice to be constituted. Had he made this most obviously necessary, but with his class of critics easily neglected inquiry, he would have found that our theologians hold the Consecration to be the chief act in the Sacrifice, while many of them regard the Communion as a part of the Mass which is complementary rather than constitutive of the Sacrifice. Hence all his vigour of assertion that

St. Justin treats of the Supper and of the Sacrifice in different works, turns out to be energy wasted ; for we are most content to let the proposition go by, that the great Apologist does not consider the Supper, in the sense of the actual eating and drinking at the banquet, to be the primarily sacrificial ceremony. Neither do Catholics generally.

(ii.) When Semisch would say wherein his author does find the substance of the Sacrifice, he answers, "*In the Consecration ;*" but unfortunately for the clearness of his view, he also inclines to answer, "*Before the Consecration,*" and *in* the offering of the materials, bread and wine, by the faithful. In favour of the time "before," he writes: The Catholic interpretation "extends over the Consecration what was there only *before it ;*" "the elements of the Supper are in Justin's mind a sacrifice *before* the consequent consecration, *on account of* their *presentation ;*"—"the reason for giving them this appellation ceases *from the instant they are the gift of God to the communicants :*" while in favour of the time "in" or during the Consecration, he writes: "Justin makes the act of sacrifice last only *till* the consecration prayer is uttered over the bread and wine ; he makes it terminate *as soon as the bread and the wine become the Flesh and the Blood of the Logos ;*" "the sacrifices took place not after the consecration of bread and wine by the thanksgiving, but *contemporaneous with and in that act ;* their material and object is the sacrifice itself, which includes the consecration." A defender of Semisch, whose query we will attend to without delay, might ask, Why try to find any confusion between "before" and "in" the Consecration, when the conciliatory sentence is at hand: "Justin called the Eucharist a Sacrifice because a thanksgiving *preceded* and *accompanied* the consecration of the elements, and because these elements were taken from the oblations which the wealthier Christians brought to their assemblies in sympathizing love for their poorer brethren." Our grounds for not regarding such a sentence as a satisfactory conjunction of the "before" and the "in," are to be found in Semisch's further explanation of the value which he attributes to such a "Real Presence" as he supposes St. Justin to teach. Of it, then, we will proceed to speak.

(iii.) Our opponent undertakes to fight with his hands shackled, that is, he professes to defend St. Justin against a Catholic interpretation, even on the two hypotheses that the Saint does not deny the special priesthood and does admit

transubstantiation. In being thus generous, the champion fails to see that in Christ's presence on our altars by transubstantiation, in two separate consecrations, one of the bread, the other of the wine, in a state of *quasi*-bondage to sacramental species under which He is pledged to abide as long as they keep their proper form, in order that He may honour God and feed men's souls to the same Divine honour, there is a combination of characters which may be taken as expressive of the sacrificial idea, and so be unfavourable to his view that the Eucharistic Sacrifice cannot be "God's gift to man" more predominantly than "man's gift to God."

Semisch allows, not only by way of hypothesis, as he allows transubstantiation and a special priesthood, but by way of fact, that St. Justin teaches *some kind* of Real Presence; how then can he make of this so small an element in the Eucharistic oblation as to affirm that "the mere presence of the Logos cannot constitute the Supper a sacrifice in the sense of the Catholic Church"? The way he manages it is, not by instituting an inquiry into the Catholic doctrine, still less by refuting it, but by fixing all attention on the bread and the wine as such, and as gifts of men given to their poor brethren in the spirit of charity. "The elements," he argues, ignoring the Real Presence and his profession to deal with the case on the supposition of transubstantiation, "the elements," that is, the physically unchanged bread and wine, "are only the outward vehicles, the material *substratum* for the actual sacrifice. As a sacrificial constituent *nothing* remains but the thanksgiving by which the sacramental consecration of the bread and the wine is introduced and completed; the sacrifice of the Supper is one of thanksgiving," in which we may "put out of sight the sense wherein Justin believed the Real Presence of Christ in the Supper." So to have put out of sight the main consideration, after professing to reason from the hypothesis of transubstantiation, is a cause sufficient why the whole of Semisch's argument is ineffectual,—as idle from a Catholic's point of view as if he were to discourse of the Sacrifice of the Cross, "putting out of sight" the sense in which Christ was really present on that gibbet.

If Christ's Death benefited man, though it was a Sacrifice in the shape of "God's gift to man," why should it be impossible for a means to be devised whereby, through a ministerial, vicarious, representative priesthood, duly authorized from above,

the same Sacrifice should take a shape in which, while remaining primarily "God's gift to man," it should become secondarily "man's gift to God," as the supreme act of worship, as pre-eminently *the* Sunday Service which St. Justin describes in outline? Catholic theologians find it hard to determine fully and exactly the way in which *de facto* it has pleased God to constitute the Mass a Sacrifice; but they have no difficulty in pointing out many characteristics which Christ may have fixed upon as expressive of the sacrificial idea in the Eucharist. It is clear from revelation, that He has fixed on some; not so clear which these are out of the number of the possible.

A further token of Semisch's neglect to let the "Real Presence," which he admits, count for anything, is his cool assumption that when Malachy exalts the Sacrifice of the New Law over those of the Old, as is done in the prophecy which Justin repeatedly quotes in connexion with the Eucharist, the Prophet "takes the disposition of the offerers for *the only point of distinction.*" Which being interpreted means, the Eucharistic oblation, though Christ is really present therein, has no value sacrificially beyond the sacrifice of a lamb or a goat, except what comes from the part of the men who make the offering. True, St. Justin says as others before and after him, that God, under the New Law as under the Old, has no need of human gifts of blood and libations, and incense;¹ but it is extravagant to push this sober-sense doctrine to an extreme, which is condemned by the precept, "Do this in commemoration of Me," and by the obvious fact that the Real Presence of Christ, our Mediator, a presence which is made to depend on the act of man, must count for something in the honour which man, by offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice, procures for God. Here especially should the words of St. Irenæus be weighed, "The offerer has glory *in that which he offers*, if his gift is accepted."² Semisch himself cannot be so blind to obvious truth as never to show any tendency in his mind to suppose that God has some regard for the gifts of men; and accordingly this tendency, though never fully followed out, betrays itself in the words, "the elements of the Supper are a Sacrifice *before* the consequent Consecration on account of their presentation," "being taken from the oblations which the wealthier Christians brought to their assemblies in sympathizing love for their poorer brethren." It was

¹ *Apol.* i. 13.

² *iv.* c. 18, n. 1.

indeed to some extent "the brethren" who received the gift, but God also, in a way not inconsistent with His absolute independence, seems occasionally to be allowed by Semisch to have a share in the object offered, at least inasmuch as He is more honoured by a prayer accompanied with a material gift than by a prayer wholly internal. We however, on our side, in the case of the Mass, consider the comparatively unimportant fact of benevolence whereby the faithful provided the bread and wine for the Sacrifice, as also alms for the poor, to be sunk in the transcendent fact that Christ, by the ministry of His priests, came down in place of the earthly substance, and put Himself on the altar in the state of a victim for the glory of God and for the benefit of men,—a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to His Father, and of atonement and impetration for us.

More recently than Semisch, Harnack¹ has given a Protestant interpretation of St. Justin, allowing, with the first named, that St. Justin teaches the Real Presence, and disallowing, in the same company, that in such Presence he places the sacrificial character of the Supper. It is much to have the above allowance made, for the style of criticism which led Harnack to evade the force of St. Ignatius's plainly Catholic doctrine by exaggerated insistence on expressions which give a metaphorical sense of the Body of Christ, might have induced him to find means of watering down the strong testimony of St. Justin; but apparently here the terms were too powerful. Recognizing, then, in St. Justin, a doctrine of the Real Presence, and of a Eucharistic Sacrifice which the critic confesses to be sanctioned by Christian consent if not by Christ Himself, Harnack says that the Apologist holds apart the idea of a gift to us of Christ's Body and the idea of the Sacrifice; that he puts the essence of the latter in prayer, and regards the elements either as symbols or vehicles—no matter which, for Christians at that time were not reflective enough to distinguish between the two; that through these vehicles are conveyed to the faithful the blessings of faith, and knowledge, and immortality. How far the presence of Christ's Body and Blood acts in the conveyance of these gifts, we are not told, nor are we informed what precisely is the value to us of such a condescension. One thing we are assured of, that St. Justin will not have the Sacrifice placed in the presence of the Body. No proof is

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, band i. ss. 151—155.

given for such interpretation ; it is simply Harnack's way of reading his author from a position out of the light of the Catholic tradition which we find to fit in with St. Justin so admirably.

The doctrine of St. Justin about sacrifice in general, and about the Sacrifice of the Mass in particular, will be found to correspond closely with what St. Irenæus has to say on the same subjects, the gist of whose teaching may be read within the compass of a single chapter, namely, in book iv. chap. 18. After having shown in the previous chapter that the rites of the Mosaic law had come to an end, he draws his inference : "Therefore the Church's oblation, which our Lord prescribed to be made all over the world, is accounted a pure sacrifice before God and is accepted by Him ; not because He needs sacrifice from us, but *because the offerer is glorified in that which he offers* when his gift is accepted. . . . We must offer to God the first-fruits of His creation, as Moses says, *Thou shalt not appear empty-handed in the sight of the Lord thy God.*"¹ Then St. Irenæus goes on to declare that not sacrifice, as such, has been set aside, but sacrifice of a certain sort. "It was not the oblation *generically* that was set aside (for oblations exist here as they did there ; as sacrifices were offered among the people of Israel, so are they in the Church) ; but *specifically alone* is there a change, inasmuch as the oblation is no longer presented by slaves, but by freemen." Christians offer not only tithes of what they possess, but in the person of the poor widow they offer their whole means of subsistence. "From the beginning God looked favourably on the gifts of Abel, because they were offered in simplicity and in uprightness ; but on the sacrifice of Cain He did not look with favour, because it was accompanied with envy and malice." "As, however, it is with simplicity that the Church makes her oblation, rightly her Sacrifice is regarded by God as pure." So far the oblation of material things to God is justified, on condition that the intention be good ; but we still want assurance that the great oblation of the Christian Church is the perpetual sacrifice which is found in the Eucharist, and that here the victim is Jesus Christ in person. To this St. Irenæus comes when he proceeds to argue against the Marcionites,² that they are inconsistent, while celebrating the

¹ Deut. xvi. 16.

² Harnack says that these were not strictly Gnostics, being far too Pauline for that.

Eucharist, in their assignment of the Jewish sacrifices and of the whole material creation to a God at enmity with Christ, as though He who regarded the altar-service of Moses and the matter used in the sacraments as irredeemably unholy, would have made the Mosaic oblations to be the types of His own, and would have so constituted His own, as to use for them the elements of bread and wine. "How can they say that the Eucharistic bread is the Body of their Lord and the chalice His Blood, if they do not acknowledge the Son to be the Maker of the world?" In further pursuance of which argument he asks again, "How can they maintain that the flesh which is fed on the Body and the Blood of our Lord is subject to corruption, and does not receive life? *Therefore let them either give up their opinion or cease to offer the Sacrifice of which I have spoken* (τὸ προφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα)."¹

As St. Ignatius had found in Christ's Eucharistic presence a refutation of Docetism, so St. Irenæus finds in it a refutation of Gnosticism, and turns then to the Catholic belief. "Our doctrine, on the other hand, is consistent with that of the

¹ The like argument also occurs, iv. 33, § 2. "How could our Lord, if He were begotten of another Father," of one alien, hostile to the Creator of matter, "with propriety take bread such as ours is, and acknowledge [that it becomes] His Body, or affirm that the mixed chalice [becomes] His Blood." Also in book v. c. ii. § 2, he pursues the argument that the Word cannot have assumed "alien flesh." St. Irenæus adds: "They are quite futile in their contention who despise the whole economy of God, and deny the salvation of the flesh and its regeneration, on the plea that it is incapable of being endowed with incorruptibility. For if it is not saved, then neither has our Lord redeemed us with His Blood, nor is the Eucharistic chalice the communication of His Blood, nor is the bread that we break the communication of His Body, for blood comes only from the veins and flesh, such as the Word made His own when He became truly Man." The testimony to the Real Presence in the last sentence is clear, and the same doctrine is shown to have been accepted, with their own modifications, by the Gnostics; for St. Irenæus gives us the story of Marcus, who, "pretending to consecrate the mixed chalice, and protracting to great length the words of the *epiclesis*, causes now a purple and now a red colour to appear, that Charis . . . may seem to make her blood drop into his chalice at his invocation." (i. 13, § 2.) Resuming again the chapter which we interrupted for the relevant introduction of the above story, we find it arguing that they are His own, not another's creatures, which God uses in the Eucharist. "As we are His members, nourished by His creatures, He gives us His creature the chalice, which is His Blood shed for us, whereby He irrigates our blood, and His creature the bread, which He affirms to be His Body, whereby He bestows augmentation on our body. When therefore the mixed chalice and the bread receives the word of God, and there is produced the Eucharist which is the Body and the Blood of Christ, serving for the increase and for the conservation spiritually of our flesh, how can adversaries deny such flesh to be capable of being divinely endowed with life eternal, since it is nourished on the Body and the Blood of Christ and becomes His member, . . . since it is fed on the chalice which is His Blood and the bread which is His Body."

Eucharist, while in turn the Eucharist confirms our doctrine [concerning the relation of Christ to the material creation]. We make oblation to Him of that which is His own (*προφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια*), preaching harmoniously the conjunction of two [natures] in one [Christ], and confessing the raising up of flesh with the spirit. For the earthly bread, having God invoked upon it (*ἄρτος προσλαβόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ*), is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, which consists of two elements, an earthly and a heavenly [that is, of Christ's Divinity and Humanity, or else of Christ and the sacramental species], so our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer doomed to corruption, but have hope of the resurrection." Then he recurs to the well-worn saying, that "it is not because God stands in want of our oblations that we make them; we offer them in thanksgiving to Him as Supreme Lord, consecrating to Him His own creature. For whereas God has no need of our presents, we do need to present something to Him," our alms, for instance, whereby we honour Him in His poor members, and other actions more immediately religious.

The above extracts are gleaned from one short chapter, namely, the eighteenth, for which the sixteenth and seventeenth had prepared the way by first defending the old sacrifices as good in their typical order (*in signo data sunt tanquam quæ a sapiente artifice darentur, non otiosa*),¹ but falsely reputed by some Jews to have an atoning merit of their own, apart even from right dispositions in the offerers.² Then he shows how the new Sacrifice requires, not only on the subjective side a proper condition of soul in the worshippers, but also on the objective side a new victim, the Word made Flesh. Hence the Jews are wanting in both respects. They want purity of soul, for they are guilty of the Blood of Jesus Christ; and they want the proper victim, for they receive not the Word who was sent to them. "Their hands are full of blood; they have not received the Word, who is an oblation unto God (*non receperunt Verbum quod offertur Deo*)."³ Accepting thus the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and holding that in the perpetually established Eucharist was fulfilled the prophecy of Malachy concerning the well-pleasing Sacrifice which was to be offered all round the globe, St. Irenæus must be regarded as a genuine sacerdotalist, for he believes in a Sacrifice quite superhuman in its essence, which consists in the consecration

¹ C. 16, n. 1.² C. 17, n. 1.³ C. 18, n. 4.

of bread and wine into the Body and the Blood of Christ, who thus becomes the Victim of all Christian altars, by a daily immolation that is bloodless, but far too real to be called a bare symbol. Thus it is that St. Irenæus supports St. Justin.

We have spoken before of the nature of Catholic theology, how its earlier works were entitled "Books of Sentences," because they were summaries of decisions gathered from Scripture and the Fathers. For example, on the very subject which now engages our attention, some of the passages which we have quoted from St. Irenæus were quoted to the same purport by St. John Damascene in his *Sacra Parallela*, because he thought them, as we do, to be clearly sacerdotal. In our theology, developed on the system of which we are speaking, we have a key whereby we unlock the Fathers: we have a fixed standard whereby we judge what in individuals among them is correct doctrine, and what incorrect; where they are true to the tradition, and where they have personally deviated from the common track. So provided, we have the conviction that the Fathers, as a body, deliver a uniform system of Christianity. Often when their expressions are vague or apparently erroneous, we think it likely that their real intent was not substantially erroneous; at other times we recognize distinct mistakes, due either to a passing confusion or to a rooted mistake in their minds. Reading interpreters of the Fathers who write from outside the Catholic Church, we judge that in many points, not in all, they are hopelessly at a loss for want of a key, for want of a standard whereby to judge, for want of the tradition. In many cases they have no test of orthodoxy, for they have no fixed articles of a creed upon the points in question. If they hold anything at all, it is in a slovenly, an unformed, a nebulous manner, such as we have seen exemplified in Semisch, who ventured to pronounce upon St. Justin's view of the Christian Sacrifice without taking the trouble to define for himself what he meant by a sacrifice, or to search out what definitions Catholic theologians had proposed. He would settle the case without previous inquiry into its data.

No doubt, in the testimonies which we have cited from the Fathers, it was possible to make the declaration of Catholic doctrine more explicit, so that all escape from the meaning should be precluded by the very rigour of the terms. When, however, we remember that such care to shut out contrary

interpretations is unusual as long as the common teaching is not controverted ; that for the most part, writers speaking from an admitted stand-point, do not exactly describe the position which they assume ; and that, because of "the discipline of secrecy," there was special reason for not being very precise in the accounts given of the Holy Eucharist, we shall not be inclined to undervalue the amount of evidence actually furnished on behalf of early sacerdotalism, on the ground that assertions are not filled up to the fullest measure of uncompromising explicitness. At the same time we shall put a limit to our admission of ambiguity in the undeveloped terminology, or want of terminology, among the early Fathers ; and in particular concerning the testimony to anti-sacerdotalism which Principal Fairbairn has sought to draw from St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, the *Didache*, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, St. Justin, and St. Irenæus, we shall protest that his inferences will not stand examination. They show much more a writer who has pinned his faith over-credulously to a man like Harnack, than one who has critically examined the sources for himself and spoken according to an intelligent estimate of their nature, not omitting that most important safeguard, the Catholic tradition, which the author of *Christ in Modern Theology*, so far from reverencing, rather glories in upsetting.

Civil List Pensions.

Palmarum qui meruit ferat.

"To Persons who have just claims on the Royal beneficence, or who by their personal services to the Crown, by the performance of duties to the Public, or by their useful discoveries in Science, and attainments in Literature, and the Arts, have merited the gratitude of their country"—the Act 1 and 2 Victoria, cap. 2, states that a sum of £1,200 shall be granted in new pensions every year to such as, in the judgment and decision of the First Lord of the Treasury, come under any of the before-mentioned conditions.

These conditions were most carefully considered by the Parliament of 1837, and for further securing the strict carrying out of the same, Clause VI. was inserted in the Act, became law, and runs as follows :

"And whereas it was resolved by the Commons House of Parliament, on the 18th day of February, 1834, 'That it is the bounden duty of the responsible Advisers of the Crown to recommend to His Majesty for grants of pensions on the Civil List such persons *only* as have just claims on the Royal beneficence, or who by their personal services to the Crown, by the performance of duties to the public, or by their useful discoveries in science and attainments in literature and the arts, have merited the gracious consideration of their Sovereign and the gratitude of their country ;' and whereas it is expedient that provision should be made by law for carrying into full effect the said resolution, and for giving an assurance to Parliament that the responsible advisers of the Crown have acted in conformity therewith ; be it therefore enacted that the pensions which may hereafter be charged upon the Civil List Revenues shall be granted to such Persons *only* as have just claims, &c. &c., and that a list of all such pensions granted in each year ending the twentieth day of June shall be laid before Parliament within thirty days after the said twentieth

day of June in each year, if Parliament shall be then sitting, but if Parliament shall not be then sitting, then within thirty days after the next meeting of Parliament."

The Civil List revenues were charged with two classes of pensions: (1) Hereditary or Perpetual pensions, and (2) Civil List pensions.

From the time of James I. (1603—1625) to the restoration of Charles II. (1660), the entire expenses of the Government, civil and military, were defrayed out of the so-called Royal Revenue, which consisted of rents of Crown estates, hereditary excise, and excise duties imposed upon articles at that time considered luxuries, but now forming the main portion of what is commonly known as the late John Bright's free breakfast-table. At that period the income-tax was unknown, and thus the Lord Treasurer could not, as now, by turning the screw to the tune of one penny, produce £1,500,000. This revenue in its disbursement was absolutely free from all control of Parliament, like the Secret Service money of the present day, which is disposed of by Ministers such as the First Lord of the Treasury, Home Secretary, Chief Secretary for Ireland, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, &c., without any further acknowledgment than the signature attached to the accounts, and the statement that the "amount has been all spent."

The Act 12 of Charles II. made a distinction in the expenditure caused by war and the ordinary cost of the civil establishments.

In 1689 the amount allowed for the Civil List was fixed at £600,000 a year, and was obtained from rents of Crown estates not alienated, usurers, and taxes to be sanctioned by "ye faithful Commons" at the beginning of each reign, and was called the Hereditary or Civil List Revenue. This was twice raised in the reign of William III. (1688—1702), and in 1698, after the war with France, was fixed at £700,000 a year.

The year 1693 gave birth to that octopus, the National Debt, following as the result of the wars with foreign Powers and the Irish, and in 1701 stood at £11,392,925. To provide for this growing incubus! fresh burdens were levied through the Customs Department, and handed over to the King for life to meet the following expenses: (1) The Royal Household; (2) the Privy Purse; (3) the Royal Palaces; (4) the salaries of the Lord Chancellor, Judges, State officers, and Ambassadors; (5) Incomes of members of the Royal Family; (6) Secret

Service money, pensions, and other irregular claims. Means for carrying on the army and navy were voted. One curious point about this monarch was that he was his own Prime Minister, and actually vetoed some of his own Bills, not being able to please the Tories nor to work with the Whigs.

Queen Anne was allowed £700,000 for the Civil List, and in 1713 the National Debt rose to £21,932,622. George I. (1714—1727) drew the same amount, and left the National Debt at £47,350,971. Owing to the King's ignorance of the English language "as it is spoke," the presence of the monarch at Cabinet Councils was abandoned, and this absence has since become the rule. George II. (1727—1760) obtained an extra £100,000 to meet his outgoings, but managed to add £30,000,000 to the National Debt on account of the wars. George III. (1761—1820) found that he required £1,030,000 a year, and he gave up some portions of the hereditary revenues, and the incomes of members of the Royal Family (about £260,000 a year) were to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund. The National Debt had by 1815 risen to the enormous sum of £861,000,000; however, as the people were pleased with the warlike expeditions, the liabilities consequent thereon were of little account, and money appears to have been "easy," as a loan of £18,000,000 was negotiated in fifteen hours and twenty minutes (1796). George IV. (1820—1830) was relieved of £255,000 of annual expenditure, and the Civil List became £850,000 a year, with the hereditary revenue of Scotland, £110,000 a year, and from Ireland a subsidy of £207,000. William IV. (1830—1837), "the father of his country," became the possessor of an income of £510,000 a year. In 1830, Lord Congleton's Committee found that many items on the books of the Civil List were really charges which should be borne by the nation, and the liabilities of the King were restricted to expenses of the (1) Privy Purse, (2) Royal Household, (3) Secret Service, and pensions usually charged to this fund. Army, navy, and civil service pensions were voted annually. The subsidy from Ireland was discontinued, and the sums derived from the hereditary revenue of Scotland were paid into the Exchequer. A notable item appears at this period, viz., £20,000,000 for the emancipation of the slaves. Her Gracious Majesty Victoria (1837—) receives a Civil List of £385,000 a year, which is allocated as follows: (1) £60,000 to the Queen's Privy Purse; (2) £231,260 to the salaries and

expenses of the Royal Household ; (3) £44,240 to pensions of officers late of the Royal Household ; (4) £36,300 to Royal bounties, alms, &c. ; and (5) £13,200 to the general expenditure of the Court. The yearly allowances of £40,000 to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, £10,000 to the Princess of Wales, £25,000 (now reduced by desire to £10,000) to His Serene Highness the Duke of Saxe-Coburg Gotha, and the other annuities to relatives of the Royal Family, are otherwise provided for. In 1871 the National Debt was £795,370,122—the Crimean War being responsible for about £30,000,000—and at the present time it is £671,042,842.

(1) Hereditary or perpetual pensions were conferred by various monarchs upon persons, mostly courtiers or natural children who may have had some slight claims on the royal beneficence, but by no stretch of the imagination could they have shown any grounds for a grant by their personal services to the Crown, by the performance of duties to the public, or by their useful discoveries in science and attainments in literature and arts. In the few cases of perpetual pensions granted to distinguished military and naval commanders, there can be little cavilling, as these were rewards, though lavish, for services rendered. The former class of pensions has over and over again been strongly condemned, and with regard to the latter it has been urged that all such grants should be limited to the persons actually rendering the services intended to be rewarded by such grants, and that such rewards should be wholly or in main part defrayed by the generation benefited by the services so recognized, and that it is unjust that future generations should be burdened with payments to persons who have had no share in the original services. The subject was brought prominently before the public by the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons appointed at the instance of the late Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., in January, 1887.¹ The sums disposed of were lavish, and naturally played "ducks and drakes" with the amount granted to the Civil List for the maintenance of royalty ; in fact, so great was the appreciation of "charity" by the various Kings and Queens, that the first law of nature, "self-preservation," was entirely lost sight of. It may be mentioned, not without pride, that during the present reign no pensions have been granted extending beyond one or two lives, and these only to persons who have merited the

¹ House of Commons Paper, No. 248, of 1887.

gratitude of their country. Charles II. was rather liberal in frittering away money. In 1676 he granted to the then Duke of Richmond and his heirs for ever the duty arising from one shilling per chaldron on all coals exported from the Tyne and consumed in England. In 1799 this valuable concession was changed into an annuity of £19,000 a year, by way of compensation for and for the purchase of this duty, popularly known as the "Richmond shilling." Between the years 1801 and 1824 this annuity was redeemed by the Government for £633,333 Stock, which in turn was sold between the years 1837 and 1868, and the proceeds invested in the purchase of estates in the counties of Sussex, Banffshire, and Inverness-shire, and the deeds presented to the then Duke of Richmond. The same monarch granted to the then Duke of Grafton and his heirs for ever the income arising from the freehold office of Remembrancer of First Fruits and Tenths of the Clergy and Officer of the Pipe in the Court of Exchequer. This valuable sinecure, with other pensions, has been bought out by various Governments for the sums of £193,000, £125,000, and £229,000 Stock, the latter being invested in the purchase of freehold estates and the deeds handed to the Duke. Up to the period of these commutations, the Grafton family had cost the public in round figures some £4,000,000. Then we have the Duke of St. Albans receiving an annuity of £965 as Master of the Hawks, although all services for money received have long since ceased, there being no hawks nor food for the same in existence. It would cost about £27,000 to redeem this pension. John, Earl of Bath, and his heirs for ever were granted a pension of £3,000 in consideration of the great and eminent services done to Charles II. and his late royal father by Sir Bevill Grenville, who died at the Battle of Lansdowne in defence of the Crown against the rebels. This sum by alienation fell to £1,200 a year, which was purchased by the Government for £32,334. The Earl of Kinnoul, a descendant of James, Earl of Carlisle, derived to himself and heirs for ever a title claim and interest in the Caribbean Islands and other islands. In this case funds ran low, as the Island of Barbados dried up, and the pension was fixed at £600 a year for five years, and at the expiration thereof the full sum of £1,000 per annum was to be paid to the Earl and his heirs for ever. The arrears were considerably forgiven or forgotten. The Kinnoul family were solaced with £18,220 4s. on the cessation of the pension. The Earl and Countess of Lichfield, in favour with Charles II.,

obtained the income arising from the offices of Custos Brevium of the Court of Common Pleas, Clerk of the Juries, and Second Prothonotaries. The right to these receipts was at various times disposed of in the open market for ready cash, and in 1884 the Government bought out the then holders for £42,203 18s. 4d. Thomas Warren and his heirs for ever were the recipients of a pension charged on the manor of Saunderville and Bray, in the county of Berks, belonging to Sir Francis Eaglefield. Sir Francis, being a zealous Catholic, left England shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth without having obtained the royal license, probably with French leave, and never returned to his allegiance, his estates being duly surveyed, seized, and possessed by the Crown. In 1661 the Duke of Albemarle was given, with other minor dots, Cheshunt Park free of tithe, with a proviso that if the Vicar at any time made good his claim to tithes the owner should receive an annuity of £28 10s. from the Crown. No claim was made until 1827, when the Vicar instituted a successful suit against the then owner, who in turn claimed the annuity. The parson, however, by thus acting forfeited an annuity of £57 charged on the land revenues granted by James I. In 1660 Charles II. was graciously pleased to appoint Arthur Hill and heirs for ever, better known as the Marquis of Downshire, Constable of the Fort of Hillsborough, County Down, charging the salary and expenses on the revenues of His Majesty, his heirs and successors. This pension was recently commuted. Every favourite of Charles II. received, either in the form of money or estates, some singular mark of their Sovereign's gracious esteem. One remarkable grant of Charles II. will bear scrutiny, and that is of the State of Pennsylvania to William Penn, Esquire, his heirs and assigns for ever. When the United States of America gained their independence the State of Pennsylvania was lost to the Penn family, and the native Legislature, in November, 1779, voted the sum of £130,000 as compensation in full satisfaction of all rights and claims to any portion of the State. George III. thought it worthy of his royal munificence and of the liberality of the British nation, that a further provision should be made for the descendants of the said William Penn, and the House of Commons for that purpose resolved that an annual sum of £4,000 be granted to the heirs and descendants of the said William Penn. This was purchased by the Government in 1884 for a lump payment of £107,780. Besides the above-

mentioned annuities, Charles II. granted innumerable perpetual pensions of small amounts to various Colleges, Rectors, Archdeacons, Vicars, Curates, Assistant ditto, additional Assistant ditto, of Church livings, and to numerous Right Reverends, Very Reverends, and Rather Reverends.

William III. (1688—1702) adopted a more martial spirit in the grant of perpetual pensions, being probably the first general who had held the crown. He granted to the heirs and their assigns for ever of the Duke of Schomberg and Leinster an annuity of £4,000. The only qualification which can be urged as a justification of this pension was that the Duke, at the Battle of the Boyne, July 1, 1690, had the indiscretion to interpose his head between a cannon-ball and a stone wall, and with what result is a matter of history. This amount, granted for assistance in redeeming this kingdom from Popery and arbitrary power, completing a prosperous, happy, and settled condition of affairs, and professing the Protestant religion, was bought by the Government in 1883 for £7,113 8s. 8d., the original sum having dwindled by alienation, &c. Another Dutchman came on the scene four years later, and in 1694, Seigneur Henry de Nassau, Lord D'Auverquerque, his heirs and assigns for ever, in consideration of his many and faithful services, were rewarded by William III. with a pension of £2,000 a year. History is discreetly silent as to those services, so the most charitable conjecture is that, as Lord Grantham, he was a well-known adherent of the King, and that the King had the power of granting these pensions. Lord Cowper, who held four-fifths of this annuity, sold the same to the Government in 1853 for £40,000.

Queen Anne (1702—1714) was not remarkable for granting many perpetual pensions, but she made up in thoroughness for lack of quantity. To John, Duke of Marlborough, of whom it is said "that he never besieged a town which he did not take, nor fought a battle in which he did not conquer," was given a perpetual pension of £5,000, and the Honour and Manor of Woodstock and Blenheim House. The pension was commuted in 1884 for £107,780.

The House of Hanover (1714) apparently fought shy of perpetual pensions, as the subject at all events was not prominent until the accession of George III., when the royal beneficence again asserted itself. We read in Act 43, Geo. III., cap. 159, "In consideration of the eminent services of Jeffery,

Lord Amherst, during his command in America, and particularly in the reduction of the Province of Canada, &c., the King was induced to direct that a grant should be made to his lordship, his heirs and successors, of a certain tract of land in that Province, but that owing to local difficulties his intentions had not been carried out, therefore a pension of £3,000 a year is granted to the heirs and assigns of Lord Amherst for ever." The difficulties referred to were in the first place that the land proposed to be granted belonged to the Jesuits in Canada, and secondly, that His Majesty's attention had not been called to Statute i. Anne, sec. 1, cap. 7, which limits the power of alienation by the Crown, and that such a grant, if it had been executed by George III., would have been utterly void, and of no effect. As a matter of fact, no grant was executed at all. This pension was bought by the Government in 1885 for £80,835. Lord Rodney, for his victory over the French off Guadaloupe, West Indies, in 1782, received a perpetual pension of £2,000. In 1806 a pension was granted to the heir of Lord Nelson, killed at Trafalgar in 1805, of £5,000, and the heirs male of his body for ever. The Lord Nelson, the first recipient of the pension, was a brother of the celebrated admiral, and the present holder is, it is believed, the great-nephew. In 1810 Vice-Admiral Lord Exmouth was honoured with a grant of £2,000 a year, and to his heirs and assigns for ever.

As compensation for the loss of the privilege of printing and vending almanacks, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge receive annuities of £500 a year respectively.

Since January 1, 1881, about three hundred and thirty other perpetual pensions, payments, and allowances, amounting in all to the annual sum of £18,957 9s. 6d. have been commuted for £527,933 18s. 4d., and the amount required to buy up the perpetual pensions now in existence would absorb about £270,000.

(2) Civil List pensions as now commonly understood are those granted solely on the conditions mentioned in the Act 1 and 2 Vict. before recited, and it may be remarked that though the rule of selection has been fairly well maintained, yet where the recipients have sprung from the class performing duties partaking of a warlike or political nature, the amount granted has been somewhat in excess of that given to those adducing valuable literary and scientific work, or studies of a deep and laborious research.

The amount now in course of payment amounts to over £30,000 per annum—in evidence that pensioners acquire or have taken a marvellous lease of life. The grain of mustard-seed, or rather, crumb of royal beneficence, has indeed grown and multiplied, reminding one of the penny invested at five per cent. compound interest at the date of the Birth of our Saviour, which would represent in the year 1860 a sum equal to about one hundred and fifty millions of globes of solid gold, each equal to the earth in magnitude.

Those desirous of obtaining a pension from the Civil List make an application to the First Lord of the Treasury either by petition influentially signed, or through the assistance of some active supporters of the Government of the day, particularly an M.P. who is not afraid to vote early and often. The request being successful, the applicant receives a notification to that effect. The lucky names are submitted with the "humble duty" of the First Lord to Her Majesty, who approves by placing the well-known signature, "Victoria, Reg.," to the document. Warrants are prepared signed by two Junior Lords of the Treasury, and countersigned by Her Majesty. These warrants are liable to a stamp of 10s. each to be affixed thereon. In the case of women the names of two trustees must be given to act on behalf of the grantees, but the duties required are nominal, and involve no responsibility. On the death of either of the trustees, the survivor acts, and afterwards one name is sufficient. The pensions are paid quarterly on or after the 5th of July, the 5th of October, the 5th of January, and the 5th of April, free from all taxes and deductions whatsoever. The financial year for this purpose runs from June to June, so that grantees coming on the list late in the year have nearly twelve months' stipend to draw, and the annual sum granted never exceeds £1,200. These are strictly one life pensions, although occasionally a re-grant is made to relatives. The qualification of "destitute condition" is rigidly enforced, and appears against the names in the return annually presented to Parliament.

It will be noticed that the decision in the choice of pensioners rests absolutely with the First Lord of the Treasury, and not with the Premier for the time being. When Lord Salisbury, in his recent administration, was Prime Minister, he held the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the late Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P., was the First Lord of the Treasury, and to the latter belonged the pleasing though invidious task of

selecting suitable holders of these much coveted annuities. It may here be noted that the Prime Minister, as such, draws no pay, and only receives remuneration when holding an office to which a stipend is attached. Ministers who have held Cabinet posts for four years, whether in broken periods or not, may claim a life pension of £2,000, provided there is a vacancy in the list, which is limited. Those who have held second class offices for six years may look forward to £1,200 a year, and if they have held third class for ten years, to £800 a year on the same conditions. There may also be five ex-Lord Chancellors receiving £5,000 a year each; this limitation has frequently led to re-acceptance of the Great Seals by an ex-Lord Chancellor in order to make room for a new pensioner. These political pensions are paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

Another sum of £1,200 a year, called the Royal Bounty Fund, is in the gift of the First Lord of the Treasury, and is distributed in amounts ranging from £10 to £50, the latter sum being rarely exceeded, and is granted to persons and objects which are not deemed of sufficient importance to justify a pension.

Among the names of those who have received Civil List pensions during the last fifty years the following are noteworthy, to which little if any exception can be taken except on the grounds before mentioned of amount. Many are still living and in receipt of rewards granted by a grateful country.

In 1839, to the children of William Aldridge, a meritorious police officer who was murdered at Deptford whilst in the execution of his duty. On the 29th of September, 1839, Aldridge was conveying into custody William Pine, a wood-cutter. A mob of about seven hundred persons attempted a rescue, and in the scrimmage Aldridge was struck on the head with a stone and expired from injuries received.—In 1840, to the widow of the late John Lander, the African traveller. Lander (1807 — 1839) was born in Cornwall, a printer by trade; he explored the River Niger, and died, aged thirty-three years, of a malady contracted in Africa.—In 1842, to Richard Owen (late Sir Richard) in consideration of his distinguished exertions in the improvement of science. Sir Richard was born at Lancaster, in 1804, and held the offices of Hunterian Professor and Conservator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, Superintendent of Natural History Departments, Zoology, Geology, Mineralogy in the

British Museum, afterwards removed to the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, Lecturer on Palæontology (science of ancient life of the earth or of fossils which are the remains of such life), and was one of the founders of the Microscopical Society.—To the sister of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Stoddart, murdered at Bokhara.—To the daughter of the late General Sir Hudson Lowe (1769—1844). He entered the army when he was twelve years of age. In April, 1816, he was appointed Lieutenant-General and Governor of St. Helena, with custody of the first Napoleon. Napoleon took an intense aversion to Sir Hudson, although the latter was a humane man, and actually raised the allowance of £8,000 a year for the maintenance of his Imperial prisoner to £12,000 on his own responsibility.—To Alfred Tennyson, in consideration of his eminence as a poet.—In 1852, to John Russell Hind, F.R.S., in consideration of his contributions to astronomical science by important discoveries. He was a son of one of the introducers of the Jacquard loom into Nottingham; was assistant to the late Sir George Airey, Astronomer Royal; joined the private Observatory of Mr. Bishop in Regent's Park, and discovered the stars Irene, Melpomene, Fortuna, Calliope, Thalia, Euterpe, Urania; and was Foreign Secretary to the Royal Astronomical Society.—To the wife of R. Welby Pugin, in consideration of his eminence as an architect, and inability in consequence of illness to pursue his profession.—To the daughters of the late Professor Dunbar, Professor of Greek Literature in the University of Edinburgh.—To Miss Horatio Nelson Ward, daughter of the late Mrs. Horatio Nelson Ward, the adopted daughter of Lord Nelson. This grant is distinct from the perpetual pension to the Nelson family mentioned in the earlier portion of this article.—In 1855, to the widow of Dr. John Kitto, author of the *Pictorial Bible*, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, and the *Bible Cyclopædia*.—In 1856, to the daughter of the late Admiral Sir William Hoste (1780—1828), "Nelson's dear friend." Sir William joined H.M.S. *Agamemnon*, Captain Nelson, in 1793, was at the Battle of the Nile, and in 1798 joined the brig *Mutine*, and while at Naples was presented by the Queen with a diamond ring, besides two hundred guineas and six pipes of wine for the crew. In 1805 he joined H.M.S. *Amphion*, and in twelve months took or destroyed two hundred and eighteen ships of the enemy, evidently the Captain Semmes and *Alabama* of those dates. He gained the Battle of Lissa and reduced Cattaro, laying the foundation of the autonomy of

Montenegro.—To the daughters of the late Lieutenant-General Sir George Cathcart (1794—1854). Sir George entered Paris with the Allies in 1814. In 1852, with some public indignation, he was appointed Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, and subdued the Kaffirs and Basutos. At the Battle of Inkermann in 1854, owing to some confusion, his company became isolated, and he was shot through the heart and buried on the hill bearing his name in the Crimea. There is a tablet to his memory in St. Paul's Cathedral.—To the widow of the late Mr. Joseph Haydn, in consideration of the numerous useful works contributed to standard literature. Author of *Haydn's Dictionary of Dates*, and *Dictionary of Medicine*.—To Philip James Bailey, author of poem, *Festus* (1839), with numerous editions, *Universal Hymn* (1867), &c.—In 1857, to Edward Capern, the rural postman of Bideford, author of many poems and "Devonshire Melodist," set to music of his own composition.—In 1858, to Jessie P. Hogg, in consideration of the literary merits of her father, the late James Hogg, the Scottish poet, familiarly known as the "Ettrick Shepherd."—In 1860, to the sisters of the late Dr. Dionysius Lardner, in consideration of their late brother's labours in the cause of science.—In 1861, to the daughter of the late Douglas Jerrold, in consideration of his literary merit.—In 1862, to Charles Mackay, in consideration of his contributions to poetry and to general literature. He established the *London Review* (1860), and was editor of *Glasgow Argus* (1844); he wrote poems, *Legends of the Isles* (1845), *Egeria* (1850), *A Man's Heart* (1860), and "Voices from the Crowd" for *Daily News*, when Charles Dickens was editor.—To John Seymer, for contributions to literature and educational labours among the natives of India, in spite of being blind within two years of his birth.—In 1863, to Gerald Massey, "as to a lyric poet sprung from the people." At eight years of age he worked in a silk factory twelve hours a day, at fifteen was an errand-boy, and at twenty-one was editor of *Spirit of Freedom*, and has been connected with socialistic, spiritualistic, and mesmeric enterprises.—In 1864, to the widow of the late Sir John Inglis (1814—1862), the defender of Lucknow from July 1, 1857, to September 26, 1857, who died at Hamburg at the early age of forty-seven. Lady Inglis was a daughter of the first Lord Chelmsford (Thesiger), and was in Lucknow during the defence, with her three children.—In 1865, to John Hayter, on account of his labours as a portrait painter.

His works, particularly the portraits of the Royal Family, show great skill.—To Richard Spruce, for his works on botany and travels in South America, and his services in introducing cinchona (quinine) seeds into India in 1860.—In 1866, to the widow of the late Sir Charles Eastlake, artist, in consideration of his high attainments in art.—To the widow of the late Sir Richard Bromley, K.C.B. (1813—1866). He was a descendant of the Lord Chancellor in Queen Elizabeth's time. Sir Richard was Accountant to the Irish Famine Commission, and Accountant-General to the Navy, in which office, by his introduction of better supervision, he effected great economies and reduced expenditure.—To Arthur Hill Hassall, M.D., in consideration of his eminence as a scientific chemist, and of his services in connection with the inquiry into the adulteration of food. He practically originated the system of giving certificates to vendors of food as to its good quality, and founded the National Hospital for Consumption at Ventnor.—To Rev. Miles Joseph Berkeley, on account of his eminent services as a botanist. He was Vicar of Sibbertoft (1868), author of *English Flora* (1836), *British Fungology*, &c.—In 1868, to the niece of the late Professor Faraday, so well known for his valuable discoveries and additional development of chemical science.—To the children of the late Edward Hincks, D.D., the learned Oriental scholar.—To Lady Jane Kirk Brewster, on account of the eminent services rendered to science by her late husband, Sir David Brewster.—To Miss Maria Susan Rye, in consideration of her services to the public in promoting by emigration and otherwise the amelioration of the condition of working women.—In 1869, to the widow of the late John Curtis, on account of his scientific attainments and of the merit of his works on entomology.—To Mrs. Elizabeth Phipson, in consideration of the useful and valuable inventions of her grandfather, Henry Cort, applicable to the manufacture of iron. These marvellous discoveries practically revolutionized the making of that most useful of all metals, iron.—In 1870, to Robert William Buchanan, in consideration of his literary merits as a poet, but better known to the present generation as the writer of many plays, such as *Nine days Queen*, in which his sister-in-law, Miss Harriett Jay, appeared; author of *London Poems* (1866), *Fleshly School of Poetry*, which was really an attack on the styles adopted by D. G. Rossetti and Algernon Swinburne. He was connected

with the *Contemporary Review*, in which many of his earlier writings appeared.—To the daughters of the late Mr. Ffennell, in recognition of the labours of their father in connection with the salmon fisheries of the United Kingdom. He was the author of many books relating to fishes and fisheries.—In 1871, to the widow of Augustus de Morgan, the distinguished mathematician.—In 1872, to Rev. F. H. A. Scrivener, in recognition of his services in connection with Biblical criticism; editor of *Greek Testament* (1886), author of *Plain Introduction to the criticism of the New Testament* (1883), these being text-books used in many leading schools. His best work is probably *Codex Bezae*.—To the daughters of the late Field Marshal Sir J. Burgoyne, in consideration of his distinguished military services. At Eton he was fag of Hallam the historian. In 1798 he joined the Royal Engineers, and in 1808 covered the retreat of Sir John Moore on Corunna. In 1845 he was Inspector General of Fortifications, a post he held for twenty-eight years. He sat on numerous Royal Commissions and was consulted on various questions, from the penny post to the site of Waterloo Bridge. He proceeded to the Crimea to prepare the ground for invasion by the allied troops.—To Miss Mayne, in consideration of the personal services of her late father, Sir Richard Mayne, K.C.B., Chief Commissioner of Police, to the Crown, and of the faithful performance of his duties to the public.—In 1873, to the widow of Captain Knowles, in consideration of his heroic conduct while in command of the ship *Northfleet*, run down off Dover, with the loss of many lives.—To Martin Farquhar Tupper, author of *Proverbial Philosophy* (1843, 1844). This remarkable work excited much interest at the period of publication, particularly in the United States, where it appealed to the tastes of the land of wooden nutmegs, because in *Hidden Uses*, page 22, he says:

The world may laugh at famine, when forest trees yield bread,
When acorns give out fragrant drink, and the sap is as fatness,

alluding to bread made out of sawdust and coffee made from acorns peeled, chopped, and roasted. The book consists of a series of wise sayings of the Josh Billings' style, on every topic under the sun. He wrote other, and probably, from a literary standpoint, better works.—In 1874, to the children of the late David Livingstone, in recognition of the value of his geographical discoveries in Central Africa.—In 1877, to the Misses De Foe, the lineal descendants of the author of *Robinson Crusoe*.

This novel, with close running from Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* and Cervante's *Don Quixote*, is the most popular ever written.—To George Macdonald, author of *Robert Falconer* (1868), *Treatise on Miracles of our Lord* (1870), *Dealings with the Fairies* (1867), &c.—In 1878, to Dr. J. Prescott Joule, F.R.S., discoverer of the laws of the evolution of heat, induction of magnetism by electric currents and of the mechanical equivalent of heat, and originator of the Kinetic theory of gases. A statue was recently erected to his memory in Manchester Town Hall.—In 1879, to the widow of Lieutenant Melvill, in recognition of his heroic conduct at the Battle of Isandlana, in the late Zulu War.—In 1880, to William Thomas Best, organist at St. George's Hall, Liverpool, since 1855. He induced organ-builders to make the bass of organ music playable by means of pedals, a saving of the left hand for the manuals and the better securing of the bass *obbligato* so frequent in Bach's music.—In 1881, to Alfred Russel Wallace, in recognition of his eminence as a naturalist, author of the *Malay Archipelago* (1869), *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism* (1875); he was also a prominent anti-vaccinator.—To Dr. Leonard Schmitz. He was the Rector of the High School, Edinburgh (1845), Classical Examiner London University (1874), gave a course of historical lessons to H.R.H. Prince of Wales and to H.S.H. Duke of Saxe-Coburg Gotha; was author of Latin and Greek Grammars and many classical works.—To Professor J. Wharton Jones. He discovered and wrote on the mechanism of blood-vessels, and the phenomena of inflammatory process, and in 1871 replied to Darwin on *Doctrine of Evolution*.—In 1883, to H.I.H. Prince Lucien Louis Bonaparte, in consideration of his services to literature and learning. He was the greatest authority on county dialects.—To Lady Palliser, on account of the valuable services of the late Sir William Palliser, the inventor of the chilled shot and of improvements of rifled ordnance.—To the widow of Scott Russell, the naval architect and designer of the *Great Eastern* steamship.—In 1885, to the mother and sisters of the late Colonel Hamill Stewart, in recognition of the valuable services rendered by him in the defence of Khartoum, where he lost his life.—To the sisters of the late Frank Power, a newspaper correspondent at Khartoum.—In 1885, to Professor Huxley, for his eminent services to science and education. He entered the Royal Navy as surgeon in 1847; came prominently before the public by a lecture in 1860 on "The relation of Man

to the lower animals," and author of numerous valuable works on Biology, or the science of life; was elected to the London School Board in 1870, and violently attacked denominational teaching, and in 1871 bitterly opposed the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.—In 1886, to Lady Farnborough, in consideration of the distinguished Parliamentary and literary services of her late husband, formerly Sir Erskine May, Clerk of the House of Commons.—In 1887, to Charles Kent, for the value of his contributions to biographical and other literature. He was for twenty-five years editor of the *Sun*, and afterwards of the *Weekly Register*; has written several theological works, the best known being *Corona Catholica*.—To Sir John Steele, on account of his merits as a sculptor. He designed the sitting statue, in grey Carrara marble, on the monument to Sir Walter Scott at Edinburgh, and numerous other statues of Scotch worthies for different parts of the world.—To the sisters of the late John Leech, the well-known artist of *Punch*, whose pictures even now are objects of great attraction.—In 1888, to Rev. F. O. Morris, the great friend of and writer on birds. His was a most prolific pen. He wrote a *Bible Natural History* (1852), *Nests and Eggs*, *British Butterflies* (1853), *County Seats*, *Moths* (1839), *Dogs and their Ways* (1871), besides numerous letters to the *Times* on ornithology.—In 1889, to Dr. James Hutcheson Stirling, for his services to philosophy and literature. He greatly encouraged the study of philosophy, particularly German and ancient; author of *Secret of Hegel* (1865), and *Schwegler's History of Philosophy* (1867).—In 1890, to the widow of Rev. J. G. Wood, the naturalist. He was a most industrious writer, and wrote, *Boy's Own Natural History Book*, *Common Objects of the Sea Shore*, *Common Shells*, *Common Moths*, *Natural History* (3 vols.), illustrated by well-known artists with pictures drawn from life. He was the editor of *The Boy's Own Magazine*, and gave lectures in many leading institutes on zoology, illustrated by coloured pastels.—To the widow of Edward L. Blanchard, who supplied the libretto of the pantomimes, for thirty-five years, for Drury Lane Theatre, and was on the staff of the *Daily Telegraph* for twenty-five years.—In 1891, to the widow of Sir Richard Burton, K.C.M.G., for his services as an explorer in the eastern portion of Central Africa, and contributions to science and literature.—In 1891, to Harrison Weir, famous for his pictures of birds, fruits, animals, fish, and flowers. He is a great authority on pigeons and cats.—In 1892, to Miss Amelia

B. Edwards, for her services to literature and archæology. She wrote article in *Encyclopædia Britannica* on Egypt, and founded the Egypt Exploration Society.—To the widow of Professor Freeman, the historian, and Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford; his best known works being *History of the Norman Conquest* and *The Ottoman Power: its Nature, Growth, and Decline*.—In 1893, to the widow of Professor Minto. He was on the staff of the *Examiner*, *Daily News*, *Pall Mall Gazette*; wrote the article on Defoe in Mr. John Morley's *English Men of Letters* (1879), and in *Encyclopædia Britannica* on Byron, Chaucer, Spenser, Dryden, Pope, Sheridan, &c.—In 1894, to the widow of Sir Gerald Portal, whose report on his mission to Uganda is still fresh. Sir Gerald joined our embassy at Cairo, became an accomplished Arabic scholar, was appointed Consul General to Zanzibar, and died soon after his return to England from Uganda.—Grants have also been made to many others who have well merited the gracious consideration of their Sovereign and the gratitude of their country, and have carried off the prize justly earned.¹

JOHN JACKSON.

¹ Authorities: *Personal Correspondence between Writer and Grantees*; *House of Commons Papers*; *Papers presented to Parliament by command*; *Parliamentary Returns*; *Men of the Time*, 1884; *Chambers' Encyclopædia*, 1889; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1879; *National Biography* (Leslie Stephen); *Ince and Gilbert's History*, 1889; *Blackie's Encyclopædia*.

Reminiscences of School Life at Feldkirch.

A YEAR spent in a foreign school does not usually leave any very deep impressions. Looking back later in life, it is more likely to seem but a dream or some curious break in one's natural existence. This doubtless is chiefly the case owing to the monotonous life led in most colleges abroad. Where, however, the country is mountainous, and attempts are made to carry out a system of recreations somewhat similar to those in English schools, there is also added a romantic novelty which may well leave pleasant recollections for life. The Jesuit College of Stella Matutina at Feldkirch, belonging to the North German Province of the Society, situated in Austrian territory, in the Vorarlberg, the most westerly portion of the Tyrol, may not have attained a world-wide fame, but few who have entered its doors can efface its impressions from their memory.

The little town of Feldkirch lies at the mouth of a gorge of limestone rock within a valley shut in by precipitous crags, with views of grander peaks beyond. It forms a natural fortress commanded by the Castle of Schattensburg, which belonged to the family of the De Montforts. Once considered the key of the Tyrol, it has been the scene of many a conflict, and the French, under Masséna, were repulsed here by the Austrians in 1799. Who can forget the view of the town from the rocks above, whence it seems as if there were scarcely room for the streets, so clustered together are the churches and houses. In many places the old walls still remain surmounted by the towers of the town gates, which, with an occasional picturesque roof or gabled window, recall a bygone age. Arcades, or covered footways with shops beneath the houses, as in Italian towns, attest both summer heats and winter snows. Through the town runs the Ill, more a mountain torrent than a river. It is divided artificially into several streams to feed the many cotton mills, the noise of which and of the swift-running water is carried away in memory by the passing traveller.

Just at the point where the river forces its way into the town, and washed at the back by its waters, stands the College, or Pensionnat. It is a large, white building, without any special architectural beauties, but forming a conspicuous object with its turret and statue of Our Lady, Stella Matutina, on the roof. The school, a large establishment, was divided into a first and second *pensionnat*, the boys of the latter being kept entirely separate from those of the former, except in class. Those of the first were all boarders, numbering about one hundred and fifty, of whom not more than a dozen were English or Americans. Many of the second *pensionnat* were day-scholars from the town.

The playground was in front of the College, surrounded by light railings, and thus open to the view of the public, who often availed themselves of the opportunity to watch the games in progress. Since that time land has been acquired on the other side of the river, where a convenient meadow connected with the College by a light bridge has given space for a playground, as well as for a gymnasium and other buildings. This is a great improvement, but our recollections are of the old order, and the old enclosure was the scene of many curious and novel games.

One of these, football on stilts, does not sound a very exciting form of sport, but it cannot easily be surpassed if played with vigour. The stilts, small, like a crutch, not more than a foot from the ground, were held by the hand at the top. An unpleasant cut over the head was not of unfrequent occurrence when the stilt slipped from the foot on attempting too vigorous a kick, and it was amusing to see the player hopping about on one foot—whirling the stilt over his head until he had an opportunity to withdraw from the crowd and to put it down to the ground again. The number of players on each side was not limited, except that the three divisions of the First Pensionnat played separately. Then there was a kind of Rugby football, when the scrimmages round the goal were both long and fierce. Amongst the players who distinguished themselves in this was a veritable Dutch giant, who stood quite six feet six inches, and towered above all the other boys as he stood at bay holding the ball above his head. His chief opponent was a French boy, perhaps the stronger of the two, solidly built, and of an almost Herculean frame. The chief fight would be generally between these two, on

opposite sides, helped by the few English and half a dozen Germans.

An attempt was made to introduce cricket in a field at some distance from the College, but it can hardly be called a success, though rounders were frequently played with enthusiasm and joined in by the masters.

The great time of the year, however, was the winter, if the frost held, as it did in the season I remember, almost continually up to March. Generally the Föhn or Sirocco, the soft African wind, brought many unwelcome thaws, and it was curious to see, when it did blow, how in a few hours the whole place would be literally under water, the snow and ice commencing to disappear like magic. Then a change in the wind would as suddenly bring back the frost. To make a skating-rink the playground was very frequently flooded; but, owing to the snow, the skating as a rule was not good, while the bathing-pond, the only piece of water in the neighbourhood, for the same reason was rarely in good condition. A more popular amusement was the Russian Mountain. This was a wooden staging perhaps twenty to thirty feet high, with steps up to a platform at the top, and a planked slide at an angle of 45° to the bottom. The slide was watered each evening, so that as long as the frost lasted it became a sheet of ice, and the frozen course was continued to the full length of the playground. Standing on the top of the platform it required at first considerable nerve to launch oneself down head foremost on a small single-hand sleigh. Such an amusement was of course simply a form of tobogganing as practised in Canada and Switzerland, the sleighs only being lighter and higher than the ordinary Canadian "coasters." The first rush was at a tremendous pace, and in case of coming to grief there was the moral certainty that another sleigh would dash into one before there was time to get clear of the "bahn." Beginners often rode cross-legged, facing the course, but the more sportsmanlike fashion was to lie on the left side and to guide with the right foot, by which means, too, far greater speed was attained. Practice however makes perfect, and before long the most successful could play ball with one another as they followed on their sleighs in quick succession the long iced track. A more difficult accomplishment was the game of ring sticking, which consisted in picking off with a stick the rings hung from a bar placed just above the bottom of the slope. To ride a kind of steeplechase over

obstacles in the course, was more a trial of endurance than of skill. The work of flooding the Russian Mountain and the playground was carried out by the boys, the fire-engine of the school being called into use, and the water drawn from one of the mill-streams in front of the College. It was no light matter, and in bitter cold weather something of an Arctic experience. The hose would freeze solid and the engine was brought back cased in ice, while the boys' clothing was adorned with icicles. Then, when the winter broke up, the Russian Mountain had to be taken down, and days were needed to clear the playground. Pickaxes and shovels were served out, and little by little the foot or more of solid ice was hacked to pieces and thrown into the river.

Another amusement, as popular at least with the English, was the mountain walks and excursions. These commenced early in spring, before all the snow had disappeared. Led usually by Father H——, one of the prefects, a great amount of ground was covered and most of the surrounding country was well explored. Sometimes running, sometimes sliding down the sides of hills covered with ice and snow, it was surprising no accidents occurred, when to follow so daring a leader, a too rapid descent through the precipitous pine-woods was only checked by dashing from tree to tree and by clinging to rocks and roots. The hot sun seemed to bring all nature into life, and it was scarcely an exaggeration to say that the vegetation could be felt growing under foot. On one well-remembered occasion in June, the woods were literally alive with snakes of all colours, though at other times not one was to be seen. On the occasion of the vine harvest, an annual pilgrimage was made to the little village of Rankweil, the scene of the labours of a Scottish Saint whose name is barely remembered. The church, founded by King Dagobert, for the repose of whose soul a Mass is still said annually, stands most picturesquely on the top of a high isolated rock overlooking the village, and is adorned with countless simple votive offerings from the pilgrims who come in crowds from all parts of the surrounding country. In a covered gallery round the outside of the church is shown a stone with deep hollows, said to have been worn by the Saint's knees and elbows in the course of his long years of prayer. After a short series of prayers for the pilgrimage, joined in very earnestly by the boys, there used to follow a feast of grapes. The rest of the day would be passed

at the Carina, the country house of the College about two miles out of the town.

Holidays were frequently spent in a most enjoyable manner at the Carina. Here, too, the boys who did not go home, spent the summer vacation. This change was so popular that many preferred to stay, as everything was done to amuse them and more liberty was allowed. Another walk was to Hohenembs, where the only Jewish community of the Tyrol is settled.

These walks, however, were only a preparation for the greater excursions of the summer. Rising at three in the morning, an early breakfast was made, when in addition each boy was provided with a large roll and two hard-boiled eggs, the orthodox way of carrying which was to hollow out the rolls and to insert the eggs in the inside. These, washed down by a drink from a mountain stream, would serve for a light repast about eight or nine o'clock, while the mid-day dinner was sent on beforehand to some spot as near as possible to the summit of the peak to be ascended, a mountain called the Gallina being a favourite goal. The top would probably not be reached before mid-day, and after a short pause to enjoy the view, a rapid descent was made to the spot fixed on. Then, after a well-earned meal and two hours' rest, the return journey used to be accomplished at a quick trot, broken only by a few minutes' stay at a *châlet* for a drink of milk with bread, which doubtless was arranged for beforehand from the College. These long excursions were a decided trial of endurance, and only perhaps a dozen boys would arrive together at the summit of the mountain, and even a smaller number reach home in good condition; it is pleasant to remember that amongst them were always more than a fair proportion of English. For many, however, these excursions were far from being a pleasure, and the majority would arrive footsore and weary without ever having reached the top of the peak. During the long vacation, for those who remained behind, a still longer expedition of two or three days was generally organized to the snow-clad Sentis, on the left bank of the upper waters of the Rhine, looking down on Appenzell and St. Gallen. The Hoher Kasten, on the way to the Sentis, was a one day's excursion affording a magnificent view of the Rhine Valley.

Nothing hitherto has been said of the indoor life at the College, nor of the studies. In winter sickness was of rare occurrence, the house being well warmed with hot air and the

windows being double, whence in summer the heat was never oppressive. The food, plain and wholesome, was chiefly remarkable for the frequent veal and mutton, and absence of beef. A dish at supper which entered very largely into the interior economy of the house, was schmarn with apple-sauce, the former somewhat similar, but far preferred to, chopped-up pancakes; this was given on alternate evenings. No Feldkirch boy would dare to confess to the amount of this delicacy he was able to account for. The health of the boys was on the whole very good, and much benefited in summer by the bathing-pond. It is unfortunate that the good old Anglo-Saxon maxim of "Cleanliness being next to godliness" is not held in higher repute on the Continent, and that the boys were not supplied in winter with baths. As a concession to British prejudices, a tub was occasionally provided in the cellar for the use of the English.

As regards the studies, the hours were much longer than in English schools, the evening study-time in particular being nearly three hours in duration. This allowed of a more extended curriculum, special attention being given to French and History, and it is not surprising that as a consequence a more thorough education was achieved. Several of the masters could speak English. The discipline was very strict, and the supervision more minute than the free-born Briton is accustomed to, and if a fault was to be found with the system, this would be the one pointed to, for unless the spirit of the school was extremely good it was likely to lead to occasional clashings with authority. Much depended on the tact of the masters, and it was seldom found wanting. As a rule, a very good feeling existed between boys and masters, and notwithstanding the strict discipline, there was little stiffness in the intercourse. No wild spirit could fight long against the almost saint-like gentleness of the late Father Link, the Spiritual Father, while the Prefect of Studies and the First Prefect were supported by public opinion in the impartial performance of their difficult duties. A very great earnestness in the studies, with a thorough enjoyment of the recreations, was perhaps the most remarkable characteristic of the school.

One of the great events of the year was the acting of a German play, on this occasion *Die Kreuzfahrt*, or *The Crusade*, in which more than one English boy took a prominent part. It is needless to say that in a German school music was not

neglected. A band was trained which by constant practice attained a high pitch of excellence. On one occasion a performance of Schiller's *Glocke*, which was long remembered, was given by the orchestra and choir; great pains were taken to explain most thoroughly the meaning of the poem and to point out how the music by Romberg expressed the same ideas. The brass band frequently accompanied the school on their walks, and on such occasions it was a sight to see the march through the town, three abreast; windows would be thrown up and people rush to the doors to see the semi-military parade. It was quite inspiring; the boys imagined themselves on the road to war and victory.

It is time to draw this article to an end. Perhaps it will appear to many to be written in too rosy a light, and doubtless at this distance of time many minor drawbacks have faded from the memory; much, too, must depend on the individual temperament; but while a longer stay might have rubbed off the glamour of a first visit to the Continent made on the threshold of manhood, still it is hoped that many who have benefited like the writer by the healthy tonic of a year's life at Feldkirch, will find this a true sketch of school life at the College of Stella Matutina.

H. G. F.

The Ultimate End of Man.

IT would seem that an intelligent being, such as man is, must necessarily be in one or other of the two following states: either his every longing is satisfied, or he is habitually longing that it should be so; to say that he does not desire to have his desires fulfilled, is a contradiction in terms. Consequently, with the single exception of the act, if such there be, which places him in the former of these two states, we may confidently affirm that each and all of his free and deliberate actions has directly, or by implication, as its final end, the placing him in this happy state. Each such act is a step towards the satisfaction of his every longing. From the very fact that it is a free choice, it is the carrying out of some one or other of his desires; and so, even if he do not actually and explicitly direct it to the attainment of them all, it is yet of its very nature intended as an advance in that direction, and cannot have any other goal. Let it not be imagined that any extravagantly selfish theory is being here enunciated; we are concerned with the very nature of an appetitive act, an act of the rational appetite or will. What we will, we will; and it cannot be that we do not intend to do something towards the complete satisfaction of the will in every individual free choice that we make. No matter how disinterested and unselfish the act may be, it is nevertheless one effort towards bringing into effect a state of things in which the appetitive faculty will rest content. "Whatever a man wishes for, he wishes for under the aspect of good; and if it is not wished for as the complete good, which is the final end, it must be wished for as tending to the complete good; for universally the commencement of anything is ordained to its perfection, as is evident both in what proceeds from nature and in what proceeds from art; and likewise every commencement of perfection is ordained to ultimate perfection, which is secured in the final end."¹ This then is in reality a

¹ D. Thomæ *Sum. Theol.* 1a 2æ. q. 1. art. 6. in corp.

kind of first principle in the subject of the final end, that every free choice of ours is made in order to the bringing about of a state of things which will leave us nothing to desire.

A somewhat fine distinction must here be made and insisted on. The satisfaction as such of the rational appetite, or in other words a state of the will in which it is contented and at rest, is not itself the final end to which our free acts are necessarily directed, though at first sight it might seem as if this precisely and nothing else had been asserted in the foregoing paragraph. A good deal, however, depends upon clearly realizing that this is not a correct view of the matter. The final end to which by its very nature every deliberate choice is tending, even though in a vague or mistaken way, is to a state of things in which the appetite will be at rest, not to the mere rest of the appetite as such. If it were indeed the latter, if the mere contentment of our will as such, were necessarily the end of all our actions, then certainly we should be thoroughly and absolutely selfish. But it is to a condition of things in which our longings will in fact be fulfilled, not to the mere fulfilment of our longings, that we cannot but be tending as to our final end. We must perforce be aiming ultimately in all we do at that which contains all that is desirable, for the simple reason that in every separate act we are aiming proximately at some one thing that is desired. In the light, then, of this distinction, which required express mention in order that the truth might clearly stand out, the first principle in regard to the final end may be re-stated as follows: for the very reason that the immediate end of every free choice is to effect something that partially gratifies the rational appetite, it follows that the final end is to effect what will entirely satisfy the same. Not then the subjective satisfaction of the appetite or will, but the condition of things, regarded objectively, in which the appetite will find complete satisfaction, is the final end of every free act.

As conceived of under this general aspect, it is pretty clear that no one can have more than one final end of his actions. In saying this, we are not at present denying that there can be in the concrete more than one condition of things which would content the rational appetite; we only affirm that a man cannot in one and the same act be aiming at two distinct results, of which each is regarded as representing the sum of all his desires; this of course would be a manifest absurdity.

The very fact that he aims at both together, shows that neither of them alone constitutes that sum. On the other hand, while it is impossible to be aiming at the final end in each of two objects, it is quite possible to have no definite object before the mind at all, but to be content with the vague and general aim, which we have seen to be at least virtually implied in every free act. Now so long as the final end is apprehended only in this general or even implicit manner, it may well be that our individual actions may diverge very widely from the true mark, and even tend directly away from it; and so it is reasonable that we should determine in the concrete as far as we can, what that state of things really is, in which our rational will may find rest, in order that our actions may really tend to it, instead of through our own fault retarding or hindering us from its attainment.

And first, taking for granted here the immortality of the soul, it is impossible that the mere existence of anything outside ourselves can be that which will set our wills at rest. An object, a state of affairs, a condition of things outside ourselves, as such, is really nothing to us at all. It is not uncommon to hear people speak as though it could be and really were; they will say: "I should be content if only N—— were happy;" but it is evident that the mere objective fact of N——'s happiness could do nothing whatever towards bringing them contentment, unless it were brought into some relation with themselves, so that at least they should be aware of the fact. We cannot (and this would seem to be the reason why the Church has condemned certain propositions regarding pure, disinterested love), we cannot leave ourselves out altogether in regard to any object of desire, for the simple reason that our desire will not and cannot be satisfied unless we in some way come into relation with the object. That condition of things, therefore, supposing that any such be possible, which will leave us nothing further to desire, must be one of which we ourselves form a part; it must in truth include a subjective state or act of ours, an attitude of our own selves; and a very little reflection suffices to convince us that we ourselves must be brought into intimate relation with some other object, before our will can cease to desire and give itself up to enjoyment. Just as there is some partial satisfaction of the lower and sensible appetite in those actions in which we are occupied with corporal food, or are brought into some intimate connection with other objects

of sense, so, if our higher and rational appetite is to be ever satisfied, it can only be through our being actively occupied in the highest way possible to us, with the best and noblest object that can engage such activity. Catholic theology declares in no uncertain way how this is to be ; it tells us plainly that the immediate intellectual vision of God, in other words, a most intimate relation between our souls and the Infinite is the condition of things which in fact constitutes the fulfilment of our desires, and sets the will free from all uneasiness to rest in pure delight. Two propositions, then, may be regarded as established : first, that the final end of all free action is to bring about a condition of things which will satisfy our desires, and secondly, that, in fact, this condition of things involves a relation of ourselves to Infinite Truth and Goodness, by which the latter is the immediate object of intellectual intuition. And here let it be noted at once that, whereas the former of these two propositions seems to suggest a selfish aim in all that we choose to do, the latter on the contrary conveys the doctrine that, as a matter of fact, a perfectly unselfish state is the one which will satisfy self, and constitute our happiness ; a state in which we are entirely absorbed in and devoted to something outside of and higher than ourselves.

We have next, with a view to the conclusions we propose to draw from the considerations of this short paper, to examine somewhat more minutely into the precise character and circumstances of this condition of things, which, as soon as it is recognized to be that wherein our rational desires will be fulfilled, ought to be the express aim of our deliberate acts of choice. It is, then, a state of things in which our entire being is completely subordinated, immolated, I may say, to God ; a state in which we recognize Him to be alone good, and consequently have no other will but His ; in which we render to Him the greatest glory that we possibly can. By no other act shall we ever glorify God so much, as by that very act of knowledge together with its accompanying love. Moreover, not only is the formal glory given to God by our own rational activities the highest we shall ever offer, but that very state of beatitude to which we shall be elevated will also be the fullest contribution to God's material glory that we can furnish ; by which is meant that it will afford more abundant material for the knowledge and praise of God by His other creatures than anything else we either do or are. Again, it must be clearly understood

that this condition of things which will satisfy our longings, is one which includes God as well as ourselves, for the simple reason that it is one in which God and ourselves are wonderfully united ; but, besides this, it includes a knowledge on our side that Almighty God is receiving not only from ourselves, but from others also, that very glory which in His Infinite Wisdom He decreed to have ; in other words, it includes the knowledge of the fulfilment of God's holy will, of all His plans and designs, and accordingly this very fulfilment is a part of that whole of which we also are a part, and of which a beatifying Deity is the pervading principle. We arrive then at this third proposition, in addition to the two already laid down : the condition of things in which our rational appetite will be completely at rest, brings with it, besides our own intimate and immediate relation with God, besides God communicated to us and ourselves wholly occupied with and absorbed in Him, a like condition of all whom God has from eternity chosen to arrive at that blessed union with Himself. "The edifying of the Body of Christ" will have been accomplished, "the perfect man," "the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ" will have been reached ; and including, as we may, the angels among those of whom Christ is the Head, all may be summed up in the words, God and His Christ. Not one appointed member will be wanting ; God's own Beatitude, His own inner life, will be communicated in an altogether supernatural way just so far as He wills. It is an organic whole, wherein God is a centre of life, and light, and love, wherein He is not only a source of being outside Himself, but a source of Divine being ; His own Beatitude, remaining infinite and undiminished in Himself, is yet extended all around to the very limits appointed by Justice and Holiness Itself ; and by hypothesis, describing as we are the state of things which will leave us personally nothing to desire, we are a part of that glorious whole ; we ourselves participate in that Divine Beatitude, that Divine life ; we are within the circle of sweet radiance whose centre is Subsistent Truth, Goodness, and Beauty. Such then would seem to be, in fact, the state or condition of things which will leave nothing further to be desired by our will or rational appetite, and such the position in it which belongs to ourselves. We are personally subordinated and entirely referred to God ; the part we play in that great festival is but one element in the magnificent chorus of praise, but a small fraction of the whole of God's extrinsic glory, or in other words, of that participation

of His Divine life, which He has chosen to communicate. And once it is recognized by each one that his own happiness is herein completely secured, it only remains that he should as far as possible direct all his actions to the realization of this end.

We picture to our minds this final consummation ; we distinguish in the Divine Being, God Himself and His own perfect Beatitude ; we see ourselves sharing, in a mysterious way that it has not entered the heart of man to conceive, that same Beatitude : and lastly, united with ourselves in the participation of it, we see countless angels and men, all in fact whom, in His foreknowledge of His own gracious assistance and of their co-operation and merits, He has destined to be members of that glorious society : "Every one in his own order ; the first-fruits Christ, then they that are of Christ, who have believed in His coming. Afterwards the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when He shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and virtue. For He must reign, until He hath put all His enemies under His feet. And the enemy death shall be destroyed last : for He hath put all things under His feet. And whereas He saith : All things are put under Him ; undoubtedly He is excepted who put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then the Son also Himself shall be subject under Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."¹ God is all to all, and all in all ; He is the Alpha and Omega, He is the first and the last ; we in our degree, and the rest in theirs, are altogether for Him, for His knowledge and praise and love. Such is the final end we deliberately propose to ourselves ; such the definite form which revelation imparts to the general object aimed at in every act of choice ; we cannot but be tending to the accomplishment of our desires, and here in fact is the accomplishment of which we are in search.

And now some important questions suggest themselves as to the nature of the act by which we explicitly make this glorious result the end of our deliberate acts, or in other words, of our lives as moral agents. We propose out of many that occur to discuss briefly the following : (1) Is it an act of love ? (2) Is it an act of the love of God ? (3) Is it an act of the love of God above all things ? (4) Is it an act of Divine charity ? Some, no less important, but more difficult questions, we reserve for a future occasion.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 23—28.

1. Is the act by which I deliberately purpose to live for the end sufficiently described in the foregoing pages an act of love? Evidently it is: wherever the will attaches itself to an end, there is love of that end. The end is recognized to be good, there is seen to be an agreement between it and our own tendencies and inclinations; in the present case the light of Divine faith reveals to us the end, as what in the language of scholastic philosophy may be conveniently styled the *bonum satiativum appetitus*, the good in which the rational appetite finds complete content; we know it in truth to be the very good that will satisfy, and therefore we are attracted to it; we deliberately propose to aim at its realization, and in doing so we necessarily love it.

2. Is it an act of the love of God, or is it not rather an act of self-love? Here it is of use to recall the distinction drawn in the second paragraph of this paper. The final end of every choice we make is not the contentment of the will as such, but a state of things in which the will shall find content; the former is a mere result of the latter, and supposes it, but does not constitute it. Hence in determining in the concrete what that state of things is, and in then making it explicitly our *final* end, it is a necessary condition that it be recognized as really the *bonum satiativum appetitus*; but by no means is it necessary that it should be aimed at, just because it is so. I cannot constitute as the final end of my desires and action a state of things in which they will be still unsatisfied; the very idea is a kind of contradiction; but having once determined what will satisfy my rational desires, I do not necessarily aim at it because it does so. That it should do so (or be regarded as doing so) is a necessary condition, but not necessarily the motive of my aiming at it. If I act rationally, yes and quite naturally, I shall not make the mere fact that it satisfies my rational appetite the *motive* of my aiming at it, unless I happen to be myself the main element in it, unless the condition of things is one of which I am the centre, and all else is referred and subordinated to me. But if, on the contrary, the condition of things, which I have recognized to be in fact the *bonum satiativum appetitus mei*, happens to be one, as it really is, in which I play a quite subordinate part, in which another is the chief good, and the source of all the good there is, then in desiring it, I shall not, unless bent on acting perversely, desire it *chiefly* because of the subjective part I take in it, or because

of the satisfaction I shall derive from it, but because of the total good there is in it; and I shall desire it chiefly for the sake of the chief good in it, and secondarily for the sake of secondary goods. And so it follows that in constituting the already described condition of things, in which God and His essential Beatitude are the centre and source, and my own and others' beatitude the overflow, as my final end, I am really and almost of necessity, unless I force myself to proceed in an irrational way, making an act of the love of God primarily, and of myself and others secondarily, and in subordination to God; I am really loving God for His own sake, myself and others, not for their own sake, but for His. "We must say that the part loves the good of the whole in the way that befits it; not so as to refer the good of the whole to itself, but rather so as to refer itself to the good of the whole."¹ In fact, it is pretty clear that whenever we aim at a good higher than ourselves, whenever, for example, we perform an act of justice from a desire to act justly, for the very reason that justice is something independent of and above ourselves, we are conforming and referring ourselves to something superior, subordinating ourselves to something beyond, and, in ultimate analysis, to subsistent Justice, which is God; consequently we are loving justice, and therefore God (not indeed under the formal aspect of the last end, but under that of Justice) rather than ourselves. It is only when we make ourselves the standard of other things that we love ourselves more than them.

And here it may be well to point out very briefly how the act with which we are concerned differs from and is related to the act of the virtue of hope. Hope takes, if we may so speak, an altogether partial view of the final end; it regards it chiefly in so far as it brings with it a subjective state of happiness, our own highest individual perfection; with this immediately before the mind, and moreover with this presented as a good difficult, though with God's promised assistance possible, of attainment, hope desires and expects to reach it. On the other hand, the act we are describing, which we maintain to be an act of the love of God primarily, and of self for God and in God, views the final end in its entirety, and effectively desires it according to due order and proportion, presupposing that attitude of will towards it in its effect upon ourselves which is the attitude of hope. For the very reason that it takes so inadequate a view

¹ D. Thomæ Sum. Theol. 2a 2æ, q. 26. a. 3. ad. 2.

of the final end, hope, as long as it is disconnected from the act of love of which we speak, is in an imperfect and, we might almost say, unnatural state, as is also the virtue of faith; the act of love puts it in its proper position, and, while supposing it, at the same time embraces, elevates, and perfects it.

3. Is the act in question one of the love of God above all things? This question is already solved in the affirmative. For if it be an act of the love of God, rather than of self or of any other, to make the given end an end at all, it is certainly an act of the love of God above all things to make it the final end of all we do.

4. Is it an act of Divine charity? All the virtues tend to God under one or other aspect of His infinite perfection; they all aim at some good, which is in us by participation, in Him eminently and essentially. But charity tends to God not as the fountain, for example, of Justice, or Prudence, but as the fountain of Beatitude. In other words, as St. Thomas insists, it tends to God precisely in His quality of last end. "The proper object of love is good, . . . and therefore, where there is a special form of good, there is a special form of love. Now the Divine Good, in so far as it is the object of Beatitude, has a special form of goodness; and so the love of charity, which is the love of this good, is a special love."¹ And, "Because charity has for its object the final end of human life, namely, eternal beatitude, therefore it extends by way of command to the actions of all human life, though not as immediately eliciting all acts of the virtues."² Everything in God attracts our rational will, but nothing more than that He is Beatitude itself, and the source of all true beatitude outside Himself. Whatever else we aim at sharing in our limited way with Him, is only a means towards sharing His beatitude. Then we shall be most like to Him, when we see Him as He is. The act, then, we have described, tending as it does primarily to God, and under the formal aspect of our last end in the supernatural order, is charity, as regards both its material and formal objects. But if elicited by one, who is not yet in God's friendship, to whom God has not yet communicated Himself inchoatively by grace, it will not be an act of charity in the full and proper sense of the term. For charity, besides being distinguished from other virtues in its immediate material object and in the formal aspect under which it tends towards God, is a love of friendship; that is to say, it takes complacency in, and

¹ 2a 2æ. q. xxiii. a. 4. in corp.

² *Ibid.* ad. 2.

desires the good described as our final end, not only primarily as the good of Almighty God, but as the good of One who is our Friend, who has already begun to communicate what He has to us, with a view to communicating all He can hereafter. This adjunct gives a peculiar quality to love, and makes it the love of friendship, and our love for God is not charity in the full sense of the word unless it possesses this quality. It seems preferable, therefore, as a matter of nomenclature, not to call the act with which we are concerned, an act of Divine charity, unless it proceeds from one who is united to God by Divine grace.

Before drawing this paper to a close, it will be helpful to answer two difficulties which may easily have suggested themselves to the reader's mind; and in so doing it may be hoped that the whole subject will receive some additional clearness.

First it may be asked, what will be the final end of those free acts of the will, which presumably can still be elicited even after the *bonum satiativum appetitus*, the all-satisfying good, shall have been attained. We may perhaps venture on the following answer, which, if it slightly modifies what has been already laid down, leaves the general argument intact. It would seem, then, that the final end of such free acts would still be the *bonum satiativum appetitus*, which, though realized in substance and to the extent of leaving no uneasy desire, may yet be conceived as capable of accidental and quite secondary development. In other words, we shall be always tending towards a complete satisfaction, though already substantially and practically satisfied.

Secondly it may be asked, whether as a matter of fact, we can be sure that all our free and deliberate acts are capable of tending towards the realization of that condition of things, which constitutes according to Catholic theology the final end. May it not be that there are free actions possible, which, while perfectly lawful, are yet incapable of furthering in any way the given end? in which case it is unmeaning to make it the end of *all* deliberate acts of will. It is no question here of deciding what is necessary in order that a free act may really tend to this final end; the question is whether every such act is capable of being so directed as to tend to it, and really to be a means to its realization. We assume that every deliberate choice of the human will may be made in accordance with right reason, or at least in accordance with what is honestly judged to be right reason; and if this be so, every free act, whatever else it

may have to recommend it, may have this recommendation, that it is reasonable and therefore right. Now it is certain that every choice which has this recommendation, that it is in accordance with right reason, has also this much higher recommendation, that it is in accordance with God's own Being, and can and naturally does imply a subordination of ourselves to God. It is pretty clear, then, that there is nothing whatever to prevent every deliberate free choice from being a desire of that complete and final subordination of ourselves to God, which is our last end, nothing, in other words, to prevent it from being an act of Divine charity; and it is equally certain that such an act must of its very nature help to the realization of the condition of things which constitutes the all-satisfying good.

To sum up: the final end of human action, that is, of free, deliberate action, is a state of things that will content the rational appetite; in the present, supernatural order, this is to be found in the Beatific Vision, in the happiness of Heaven; this happiness implies a relation between ourselves and God by which we are entirely referred to God. Effectively to desire this happiness above all things is, from the very nature of the case unless we do violence to ourselves, to subordinate self to God, to put Him first, to make Him the chief good, to love Him above all things; and this, in one who already possesses by grace an earnest and a pledge of beatitude, is Divine charity. Lastly, without determining at present what is required in order that any free choice may really be a means to the attainment of beatitude, there is nothing in the nature of things to prevent them all from being so, nothing in fact to prevent any individual act of the free-will from being actuated by the motive of Divine charity.

C. BLOUNT.

Thoughts on "The Imitation of Christ."

Who hath not heard it spoken,
How deep you were within the Books of God?
Shakespeare.

I.

NOT long ago, in the great Reading Room of the Museum, I had open before me a small "lean" folio of one hundred and seventy-six leaves, one of the early "Incunables" or "Fifteeners." It was bright and clean, as though it had been issued only yesterday from the press, with that air of elegance and picturesque dignity which distinguishes so many of these early efforts. It was arrayed in a handsome purple "jacket," and bore the crown and monogram of George III., to whose fine library, known as "The King's," it belonged. It was actually the first printed issue of *The Imitation, or Following, of Christ*, the work of Gunther Zainer, sent forth from the good city of "Augus. Vindel," or Augsburg.

It was a strange, curious feeling, the having before one, and holding in one's hand, the parent of such a progeny—for there have been more copies of the *Imitation* printed than of any book save the Bible. It is the most popular and most read. No other work written by man has enjoyed, and still enjoys, such a circulation, for, as Fontenelle has said, the Bible is not to be counted an exception, as it came from the Almighty. It would be curious and interesting to speculate how many hundred thousand souls it may have saved, or put on the way to salvation; and, by a poetical stretch, I could fancy, as I turned over the pages, that their grateful spirits were fluttering around in the air, blessing the old tome.

Dr. Johnson, describing the extraordinary favour enjoyed by this great book, used the happy phrase, "The world has opened its arms to receive it." He then quoted a passage which, he said, had always struck him forcibly. "If thou canst not make thyself such as thou wouldst be, how canst

thou expect to have another exactly to thy mind?" This shows the value of criticism from such an intellect as Johnson's, which, almost without effort, always seized on what was most striking or telling. Many persons who have studied their *Imitation* may have overlooked this pregnant saying, or perhaps have not noticed its extraordinary force. They have read the book as they would any religious work of meditation, or have been attracted by other passages of a more conventional kind. Yet this truth, so irresistibly logical and convincing, when we reflect on it a moment, seems to comprise the entire rule of a religious life. A zealous person, wishing to make his neighbour good, and with an eagle-eye for blemishes, will find himself checked in his efforts as he encounters this wholesome saying: and with a sort of shame, and a smile even, will have to own, that the reforming of others ought, for decency's sake, to include the reforming of himself: and that if he be lenient to himself, others are entitled to the same indulgence. When repeating this saying to friends, I have always noted how much they are impressed, as by some novelty. It may be said, indeed, that no better specimen could be chosen to convey an idea of the general wisdom and sound common-sense of this wonderful book.

But Johnson's faith in the *Imitation* was extraordinary. On one occasion he quoted a statement that it "had been printed in one language or other as many times as there have been months since it first came out." His various editors have cried out against the exaggeration of this assertion. Malone made the calculation that this would amount to nearly four thousand editions, which he seems to dismiss as absurd. Mr. Croker adopts this view, and Dr. B. Hill wonders that Johnson did not apply "his favourite test for exaggeration, viz., counting." He implies that if Johnson had done so he would at once have seen the absurdity. The last editor of all, Mr. Mowbray Morris, says he "seems to have lapsed from a distinctive mark of his character, the *incredulus odi*." But all these wise men, who are so "cock sure," are quite astray here, and it is remarkable that Johnson, who in other instances was certain to scoff such statements out of court, should here have accepted this tale with honest faith. Some thirty or forty years ago, Père Becker laboriously formed a list of all the editions, and discovered that there were at least three thousand, and when preparing a new edition of his work enrolled nearly three thousand more, thus

completely substantiating Johnson's statement, with a handsome margin to boot.

A Kempis and Shakespeare may be fitly joined in company. Indeed there is in the "Bard" a divine fulness and dignity which often suggest our author. There is the same grand reserve as in the lines placed at the beginning of these speculations :

Who hath not heard it spoken,
How deep you were within the Books of God?

He has innumerable passages exactly in the tone and spirit of the *Imitation*. Such as :

Let me be ignorant and in nothing good
But graciously to know I am no better.

If thou'rt rich, thou'rt poor,
For, like an ass whose back with ingots bows,
Thou bear'st thy heavy riches but a journey,
And death unloads thee.

He's truly valiant, that can wisely suffer
The worst that man can breathe, and make his wrongs
His outsides : to wear them like his raiment carelessly
And ne'er prefer his injuries to his heart
To bring it into danger.

You have too much respect upon the world—
They lose it that do buy it with much care.

Talkers are no good doers.

We must not stint
Our necessary actions, in the fear
To cope malicious censures.

Love thyself last : cherish those hearts that hate thee
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace
To silence envious tongues : Be just and fear not.

One would surely think that he had read his *Imitation*.

There seems to be something prodigious or even miraculous, associated with this book, even at its starting, as though a portent of the course that was before it. It is thought wonderful that over a score of editions of the Holy Bible appeared between the date of the invention of printing and the close of the fifteenth century. But few would suppose how many editions of the *Imitation* came forth in that period. No less than *eighty* have been counted up, and there are likely to be more.

Boswell mentions: "I had seen in the King's library, sixty-three editions of my favourite Thomas à Kempis, amongst which it (*i.e.* one) was in eight languages: Latin, German, French, Italian, Spanish, English, and Armenian;" on which Johnson said that he thought it unnecessary to collect many editions of a book which were all the same, except as to the paper and print; "he would have the original and all the translations, and all the editions which had any variation in the text." It will be noticed that the worthy, impulsive Boswell calls it his "favourite." It is scarcely known that when a young man at college, he was actually converted to the Catholic faith, and though he was later talked out of these opinions, he was during his life, like his great chief, all but a Catholic at heart. No one, indeed, could make "a favourite book" of the *Imitation* without imbibing, through the pores, as it were, a genuine Catholic feeling. Which suggests the well-meant, all but grotesque, attempts of Protestant admirers to force it into some sort of harmony with their opinions, or at least to neutralize and render colourless the more "awkward" portions. This would seem a desperate undertaking. Some have indeed "cut the claws," and boldly suppressed what was too plainly expressed. It may be said, however, that no Protestant can honestly read or admire the book, without being confronted with this inconsistency. One with such noble "super celestial" thoughts could not have room also for "the monstrous superstitions of the Romish Church;" nor could one of the latter's "blinded devotees" engender such elevating ideas.

Returning to the small lean folio that I held in my hands at the Museum, it seems to have been thought so lightly of, that it was sent out as one among a collection of pious treatises, such as "*Hieronimus et Gennadius de viris illustribus: Idem de essentiâ divinitatis: Thomas Aquinas de articulis fidei: Augustinus de quantitate animi: idem de soliloquio: Speculum peccatoris:*" &c. Then after these came, modestly introduced, "*Libri iv. De Imitatione Christi*," running to seventy-six folios. Four other treatises follow. But this little treatise is the only one of the collection that has the printer's name at the end. It seems therefore likely that it was at first issued separately, and was later joined to the other treatises.

It might be interesting to recall the names of the spirited, venturous printers who were the first to introduce great books to the world: such as the Kobergers and others, who issued

the Bible; Isaac Jaggard and his partner, who gave us Shakespeare; Constable, who brought out the Waverley Novels; Moxon, to whom we owe *Elia*; the publishers of *Don Quixote*, of *Robinson Crusoe*, of *Gulliver's Travels*, and of the *Vicar of Wakefield*, and many more. The name of the worthy Gunther or Ginther Zainer, the first publisher of the *Imitation*, deserves on this account to be enshrined in all hearts. He thus introduces the work: "*Viri egregii Thomæ montis S. Agnetis in Trajecto regularis canonici Libri de Xti Imitatione numero quatuor finiunt feliciter per Gintheum Zainer ex Reutlingen progenitum litteris impssi ahenis Augustæ-Vindel.*" Circa 1471. That is to say: "The four Books on the Imitation of Christ, by that eminent man Thomas, Canon Regular of Mount St. Agnes, in Utrecht, happily finished by Ginther Zainer, born at Reutlingen, and printed from bronze type at Augsburg." He supplies no date; but the year is either 1470 or 1471. Bibliographers can fix dates very accurately from the form of the letters used and the general character of the printing. It is pleasant, therefore, to think that the excellent author, who died in 1472, may have just lived to see the first printed copy of his invaluable treatise. Zainer ventures on the amiable boast that he has printed it "with the utmost accuracy" (*accuratissime*). A learned bibliographer, Baron Weestreenen, contends that this calling attention to the type, "*litteris ahenis*," means that it was stereotyped, which is surely pushing the thing too far. The printer was merely claiming crédit for using bronze letters, instead of, I suppose, the usual lead ones.

But now follows a curious and rather perplexing thing. Only one year after à Kempis' death in 1472, there appeared a collection of his works in one tome, a pretty quarto of the usual small size, and brightly printed, but which does not contain the *Imitation*! This, no doubt, is a great point for the Gersonites. For it was published at Utrecht, not far away from Mount St. Agnes. The publishers were Ketelaer and G. de Keempt.

One of the most interesting of the early editions is that issued from Nuremburg in the year 1494. It is remarkable from the controversial nature of the title, which ran: "*Opera et libri vite fratris Thomæ de Kempis ordinis canonicorum regularium, quorum titulos vide in primo folio Andreæ Assti Anno Christi 1494. Nurembergie per Caspar Hochfeder.*" It contained 182 pages in double column, each column having fifty-three lines. And it sets forth this rather exceptional claim, in a form

rarely found in books of the period: "*Dulcissimi ac Divi Thome de Kempis . . . de Imitatione Xti opus; qd falso apud Vulgares Gersoni Parisiensi cancellario impingit . . . libell. prm. incipit.*"

This very significant utterance shows that a hot controversy was already being carried on as to the authorship; the terms "most sweet and heavenly," applied to the writer, suggest the devotion of partisanship. The words "falsely credited by the vulgar" are rather unusual in books of the time.

The worthy printer, Caspar Hochfeder, at the close of the book, modestly claims credit for the pains and care with which it had been printed.¹ It contains various other works of the author, in what is called German text, set out with all kinds of puzzling abbreviations; but the *Imitation* is placed first, an evidence of its importance. There is also found here a curious letter prefixed, addressed by a Carthusian, Father Kechhamer, to "Master Peter Danhauser," in which he reminds the latter of his former devotion to books of poetry and philosophy, with some hints of his neglect of spiritual things; and he invites him to atone for his neglect by careful study of these writings, and by editing and seeing through the press this admirable book. "Master Peter," acknowledging his former laxity, engages to give his best care and pains to the task. At the end it is styled "a golden treatise, and exceeding useful, on the perfect imitation of Christ and the true contempt of the world."

There is an edition without date or place (*sine anno et loco*, description dear to the bibliographers), that has a curious reference in the title, which supports the contention that the name of the work was accidentally taken from the first chapter. It runs: "*Libellus consolatorius ad instructionem devotorum, cujus primum capitulum est de imitatione Christi et contemptu omnium vanitatum mundi. Et quidam totum libellum sic appellant scilicet libellum de imitatione Christ.*" That is: "A little book for the instruction of the devout, whose first chapter

¹ This claim shows how well the work, though unpublished, had come to be known during the fifty years since it was written. The number of MS. copies which are now in existence—in England alone there are nearly a score—shows that it enjoyed a "large circulation." Some of these are in the handwriting of the author, who was a great and skilful copyist, and had copied the whole Scriptures in three or four years. My friend, Dr. Inglis, who has a rare and choice library of "cradle works," possesses a sort of practice book, that once belonged to one of the illuminators. It is full of experiments, unfinished initial letters, and the like. On one page we find "the alphabet of Thomas à Kempis, the monk," a number of pious sayings commencing "A, B, or C," &c., to the last letter. The owner is inclined to think it is the work of à Kempis himself.

is on the Imitation of Christ and the contempt of all the vanities of the world. And there are certain who thus style the whole book, to wit, 'The Book of the Imitation of Christ.' In one early edition without date, we even find the three claimant authors in company: to wit, Thomas à Kempis, Gerson, and St. Bernard. "*Tractatus fratris Thome de Kempis canonici regularis ordinis: St. Augustini de Imitatione Christi, &c., cum tractaculo Gerson de meditatione cordis: Speculum Bernardi de vita.*"

The publishers often became so intrigued by these claims of authorship, that we find them at times passing by the matter altogether. One simply announced that it was by "*quodam viro religioso*;" another gave merely the title of the book as: "*Incipiunt ammonicones ad spiritualem vitam utiles. Cap. primum de imitacoe Xpi. In civit Metuei Colini 1482.*" But only the first book is given. An edition of 1485 announces it to be the work of "Gerson Cangelarii" (*sic*): another calls him "Maistre Jarson." Bibliographers note that the first edition, with a date, that claims Gerson as the author, is that of 1485.

Every one has heard of the Elzevirs, whose elegant little "pocket" volumes, printed with exquisite taste, used to be the delight of collectors. About the middle of the seventeenth century they issued their edition, which is still considered the most rare, charming, and costly of the series. The Elzevirs were the great Protestant printing house of Amsterdam and Leyden: while the Plantins—whose enticing workshops are still shown at Antwerp—issued a Catholic edition. People often smile at the enthusiasm displayed over these and other typographical "curios," but such is unreasoning and unreasonable prejudice. This book, in particular, is a beautiful and elegant thing, from the smooth "satiny" paper, the exquisite outlines of the lettering, and the picturesque harmony of the page. It is closely printed: yet the effect is most clear and distinct. It was even said that they used silver type: but it is likely to have been bronze, to secure clearness and sharpness. An Elzevir à Kempis in fine condition—a tall copy is measured in millimetres—fetches three, four, and even five pounds. You must see, too, that you have the right issue, for there were three of this one edition.¹

¹ In one of their rare little classics—the genuine edition, like and equal to the others in every point save one—you must take care that you find "the Bull's Head" somewhere, or you are undone.

II.

It is gratifying to find that two of our most famous English printers, Wynkyn de Worde and Pynson, were the first to print the *Imitation* in English; though it seems strange that Caxton, who printed so many devotional works, should not have thought of introducing the *Imitation* to his countrymen. Wynkyn de Worde's edition is without date, and is thus described: "*A full deuoute and gosteley Treatyse of ye Imytaciō and Followynge ye blessyd Lyfe of our Mercifull Saviour Cryst. The same compyled in Latin by the right worshipfull Doctor Mayster John Gerson: translated into English in the year of our Lorde MDII. by Mayster Wyllyam at Kynson Doctor of Dvynte, at the special request and commandment of the full excellent Pryncesse Margate Moder to our Soveraigne Lord Kyng Henry the VII. and Comtesse of Rychemont and Dudley.*" This pious lady, by the way, had already interested herself in one of Caxton's ventures. In 1490, that printer had issued "*The Fifteen O's, and other Prayers*, printed by commandment of the Princess Elizabeth, and also of the Princess Margaret, by their most humble subject and servant, William Caxton."

The translation of the Fourth Book, on the Holy Eucharist, was the work of the Princess herself, and the whole is garnished with the arms of the King, and those of the royal translator. The title sets forth: "Here beginneth the forthe Boke of ye followynge Jesu Cryst and of the Contempnyng of the World. In prynted at the Commandment of the most excelent Princess Margaret and by the same Pryncess it was translate out of Frenche into Englysshe in fourme and maner aforesaide the yere of Lorde our God MDII." The translation is quaint enough and effective. It commences with what it styles a "Prologue." "Come to Me, seythe our mercyfull Lord, all tht laboreth *and be charged*, and I shall give unto you Refeccyon." "Be charged" is pleadingly forcible.

A specimen of the translation, taken from the earlier "Bokes," will be found interesting.

"Oh! how jocund and pleasant a life should it be to a soul, that had no worldly thing to do but love God continually, with all his heart, in works and words! Oh! if we might continue in this life without bodily refection, as eating and drinking, sleeping or any other bodily refection of our soul; then we

should be much more happy than we be now, in serving and attending more for bodily things than ghostly profit. When man cometh once to that perfection, that he seeketh consolation of no creature, then beginneth he to have a spiritual *tallage* in God: and when he is content with every fortune, as well with adversity as prosperity: confirming and referring all his words to God to serve and to obey His will. Ever remember the end of everything that thou beginnest; and also, that, time lost cannot be recovered: and thou shalt never obtain virtue without labour and diligence: and when thou beginnest to be remiss in spiritual labours then thou beginnest to wax evil."

Nor was this the only English royal personage associated with the book. Catherine Parr, the Queen, or one of the Queens, of Henry VIII., prepared a little volume of *Prayers and Meditations*, drawn from the *Imitation* itself.

Another famous English printer, Pynson, also supplied an edition: "The Imytacion and Followynge of Christ Emprynted in London by Rycharde Pynson. The yere of our Lorde MDIII the XXVII day time. At the George Flete Strete." This was a duodecimo, and was virtually Wykyn's version altered and amended. Our printer, however, cannot refrain from "vilipending" a little his predecessor's work. "And though III. of the first Bokes have been before this tyme right well and devoutly translated into Englysshe by a famous Clerke called Maister Wyllyam Atkinson which was a Doctour of Divinitie yet for as moche as the sayd translator for some cause hym moving in divers places lifte out moche parte of some of the chapytres, and some varied fro the letter—therefore the said III. Bokes be eftomes translatyd." It is then objected to the Princess' translation of the Fourth Book that it was done out of the French and therefore "could not follow the Latyn *so nighe*." Princess Margaret and her pious work was thus treated pretty much as she might have been by a modern reviewer. It is remarkable that, both in England and in France, the book should have thus been stamped by royal patronage.

It is creditable to devout Protestant appreciation of the *Imitation* that the first Protestant translation should have been made so early as the year 1580. It is often supposed that Stanhope's was the first; at least this is the version most generally found in libraries, or "on the stalls." This rare edition is thus described: "Kempis (Thomas à).—*Of the Imitation of Christ*, Three, both for Wisdome and Godliness,

most excellent Books, made 170 yeeres since by One Thomas of Kempis, and for the Worthiness thereof oft since translated out of Latin into Sundrie Languages, by divers godlie and learned men, Now newlie corrected, translated, and with most ample textes of the Holie Scriptures illustrated by Thomas Rogers. Imprinted at London by Henry Denham, dwelling in Paternoster Row, at the signe of the Starre, being the assigne of William Seres 1580." "Woodcut frontispiece, engraving on reverse of last page of Preface, and printer's colophon at end of book, 12mo, A very large copy in old sheep, with many rough leaves, genuine and unwashed throughout. This," adds Messrs. Pickering, "the First Edition of Rogers' Version, we believe to be almost unique, it being hitherto undescribed; the earliest edition quoted by Watt, Lowndes, Allibone, and other Bibliographers, is that of four years later (1584)." The price asked for this rarity was £10. Another early version was that of John Worthington made in 1677. Here is a quaint description of another of the English versions: "A boke newly translated out of Latyn into Englysshe called *The Followynge of Chryste*. Hereafter followethe a boke called in Latyn *Imitatio Christis*, that is to say in English, *The Followynge of Christe*, wheren be contand four lytell Bokes, which boke, as some men affairme was first made and compyled in Latyn by the famous clerke Mayster Johnan Gern." This *Followynge of Christe* has always been a favourite title, though as a translation of *Imitatio* it is scarcely warranted. "Following" is less strict, has more independence than "Imitation."

But there have been innumerable versions in English, Catholic and Protestant. A favourite title was *The Christian Pattern*. Stanhope's version has a certain archaic flavour which corresponds with the text. But not unnaturally the plain Catholic doctrine, exhibited in passages dealing with the Eucharist, led to some very serious tampering with the text. I say, not unnaturally, because the position was an embarrassing one.

That worthy bibliomaniac, Dr. T. Frognal Dibdin, also furnished a translation, with an Introduction and Portrait, which was issued by Pickering in 1828. It need not be said it is worthy of the translator's taste in typography. "A' Kempis. — *Of the Imitation of Christ*, translated from the Latin, with a long and valuable historical and literary Introduction by T. F. Dibdin; illustrated with a portrait of A' Kempis, a

beautiful portrait of Christ after Guercino, an engraving of Da Vinci's Last Supper, and 3 other plates, all engraved on copper in the most finished manner. Pickering and Major, 1828."

A notable edition was that of Sebastian Castalio, who had edited the Bible, and who gave an edition "in elegant Latin, reprinted here and abroad, and often put into the hands of our youth at Cambridge." This amounted to rewriting the work, a rather "free and easy" proceeding.

The fashion in which the work was really tampered with in English translations, or rather adaptations, could not be better illustrated than by the following: "*The Christian Pattern, or, The Imitation of Jesus Christ*, being the genuine Works of Thomas à Kempis, containing Four Books, viz.: 1. The sigh of a penitent soul, or, a treatise of true compunction. 2. A short Christian Directory. 3. Of Spiritual Exercises. 4. Of Spiritual Exercises, or, the Soliloquy of the Soul. Translated from the original Latin, and recommended by George Hicks, LL.D. 1707." This last item is "good." To conceive of this great work of all the world being patronizingly "recommended" by one "George Hicks, LL.D.!"

Another of these "adaptations" was issued in 1841, in which all the "awkward" passages were taken out, and consigned to notes at the end; and to the work is given this praise, that it can be satisfactorily "compared with the *Sacra Privata*" of Bishop Wilson, a work of which the world in general does not know so much as it does of the *Imitation*. The Bishop however thought, it seems, that "in order to dispose our hearts to devotion, the active life is to be preferred to the contemplative." "Doubtless," the editor adds, "to both of these holy men may not inaptly be applied the words of the poet:

Self have I worn out thrice thirty years,
Some in much joy, and many in tears,
Yet never complained of cold or heat,
Of summer's flame, nor of winter's threat,
He never was to fortune foeman,
But gently took that urgently came,
And ever my flock was my chief care,
Winter and summer they mought well fare."

Which is almost ludicrously inapplicable, at least to Thomas à Kempis, who was not likely to give a thought to "summer's flame or winter's threat," or to think of fortune as "a foeman," and had no "flock" to look after. But it shows how almost

unintelligible is the real Catholic principle to those outside. The translation, which is one of 1677, is moreover very bald, and suggests an attempt to copy the forms of the Book of Common Prayer. Witness the opening verses: "These are the words of Christ by which we are admonished how we ought to imitate His life and manners, if we will be truly enlightened, &c. Let therefore our chiefest endeavour be, to meditate upon the life of Christ. The doctrine of Christ exceedeth all the doctrines of holy men," &c.

In 1889 another odd but well-meant "freak" was attempted in England, under Ritualistic inspiration, in the shape of an English translation "now for the first time set forth in rhythmic sentences, according to the original intention of the author." It was garnished with a Preface, the work of the late Canon Liddon, and has reached a second edition. This is of course founded on the musical theories of the German Hirsche, which seem a little fantastic and far-fetched. He fancied he had discovered in the original MS. various cabalistic marks addressed to the reader, which seemed to direct that a metrical form should be given to the recitation. But I suspect this is quite accidental, and after the principle of the "Shakon-Bakespeare" controversy. It will be recalled that there are passages in the *Old Curiosity Shop* which take this metrical shape in a very curious way. Dickens, however, certainly never intended such a thing. There was yet another Protestant, or High Church translation in our own time by Mr. Keble. There has just been issued, too, an exact *fac simile* of the first edition, with an introductory essay by another High Churchman, Canon Knox Little. I have been assured that it is the fashion among Protestants of a more robust type to prefer Bogatzky's *Golden Treasury*, which is considered a treatise of much the same character and merit.

The favourite Catholic translation was issued in 1744, and was the work of Dr. Challoner, whose well-known initials, "R. C.," are attached to it. This, I presume, is the popular version now in use. It was fortunate that it was attempted thus early, though scarcely early enough, for it is cast in a rather antique and quaint phraseology. Our modern familiar tongue would never suitably present the author's ideas.¹

¹ I find in a catalogue this tribute to the influence of the author: "A' Kempis: *Of the Imitation of Christ*. Translated by F. P. Bamfylde. A neatly written MS. for the use of his two daughters Bridget and Mary, 12mo, calf, 15s."

In all there have been the astounding number of some sixty translations into French of the great book. The French *editio princeps* is ushered in thus quaintly: "*Cy comance le liure tressalutaire de la ymitacio Jhesu Christ e mesprisement de ce monde, premiermet compose en Latin par saint bernard ou par autre deuote persone attribue a maistre jehan Gerson. . . . et apres translate en francoys en la cite de Tholouse. . . . Cy finist le liure de le ymitacion. . . . imprime a Tholose par maistre henric Mayer alaman lan de grace mil. ccc. LXXXVIII. et le XXVIII. jour de May.*" This, like all very early French "cradle" works, is of extraordinary rarity, and it was not until the year 1812 that the Royal Library at Paris was able to secure a copy. In most of the early French editions we find the work styled *tressalutaire*. This title is almost amusing from the very cautious speculation exhibited. The reader may take his choice of St. Bernard or of "some other pious person," though it "has been attributed to Maistre Jehan Gerson."

The Italian issue, oddly enough, was of the same year: "*Giovanni Gerson dell' imitation di Christo e del dispregio del mondo venezia Rosso de vercelle 1438.*" The German was earlier than either, by two years. We find "*Ein ware nachuolgung Christi Augspurg, An.sorg. 1486.*"

One of the most gratifying instances of the compelling power, or magic even of the *Imitation*, is the great Corneille's association with it. On his plays being received with some coldness he turned his thoughts and energies to the translation of the great book. According to another story this was imposed on him by his confessor as a penance. The poet, however, entered on his task *con amore*; it was a business of extraordinary difficulty and drudgery, but he continued to translate not the *Imitation* merely, but Psalms, Offices, &c., often reverting to his *Imitation*, whence he drew meditations and reflections, which he cast into metrical shape. Here are some specimens of his translation:

Qui ergo se abstrahit a notis et amicis, approximabit illi Deus cum anglis sanctis.

Qui se detache donc pour cette solitude
De toutes amitiès et de toute habitude,
Plus il rompt les liens du sang et de la chair,
Plus de Dieu la bonté supreme,
Par ses images et par lui meme,
Pour le combler de biens daigne s'en approcher.

Sed humanum est, hujusmodi imaginationibus illudi :
Et parvi adhuc animi signum, tam leviter trahi ad suggestionem inimici.

Mais l'homme de soi-meme a ces désadvantages
Qu'il se laisse éblouir pas de vaines images ;
Et qu'il s'en fait souvent un fantôme trompeur
Qui tire tout à lui son espoir et sa peur.

One or two of his comments show a rare understanding of the principles of the *Imitation*. Thus he says of the author, that "having given an abundance of admirable precepts in the first two books, and wishing to ascend yet higher in the others, and teach us the whole practice of pure spirituality, he seemed to begin to mistrust himself: and fearful that his authority would not carry weight enough to transport us into feelings so detached and apart from nature, he descended from our Saviour's seat, and introduced Him in his place." It is thus he explains the change of style in the different books. And again: "This grand personage (the author) has taken as much pains not to be known, as the world has to discover him. I fancy he would not give us the fine precept of humility *ama nesciri*, if he had not practised it himself."

It must be said that his system carries the art of dilution and paraphrase to an extreme length, and suggests our own Sternhold and Hopkins, or even Tate and Brady. It must be a curious order of mind, and eminently French, that could prefer such amplitudes to the close, nervous simplicity of the original. He began with the experiment of a score of chapters, but the success was so extraordinary—twenty or thirty editions being disposed of—that he was encouraged to go on, and completed his task to the same measure of approval. So true is it, as some one finely said, that "our good God never shows Himself ungrateful to those who work for Him." Corneille issued a noble edition with a scriptural engraving for every chapter. We owe to him, too, an admirable descriptive phrase, when he calls à Kempis "The Sovereign Author."

There was a popular French translation, first issued in 1673, by one Cusson, who besides being a publisher, was also "an advocate of Parliament." It had an engraved *vignette* at the head of each chapter. His son added some "reflections and prayers" at the end of each chapter, which were written by Father Gonnellieu, a Jesuit, and which are sound and useful reading, though a little suggestive of the process of "painting the lily."

With one French version there is an odd story associated. The Abbé de Choisy, in 1692, issued a translation in duodecimo, with a dedication to Madame de Maintenon; one of the vignettes exhibited a lady on her knees, with a number of young girls grouped round on steps, and the motto, *Audi Filia*. The scene was naturally supposed to refer to the school of St. Cyr. The malicious wits, however, supplied the rest of the verse, *et concupiscet Rex decorem tuum*. The Abbé, who was much rallied on this account, suppressed the picture and substituted another, but in a later edition the old plate found its way back again. Nothing was sacred—even the *Imitation* itself—for “the sappers” of the Court.

PERCY FITZGERALD.

Early Anglican Divines on Episcopacy.

[Though correspondence does not as a rule find a place in our pages, we are glad to make an exception in favour of the following communication.—ED.]

To the Editor of THE MONTH.

SIR,—As THE MONTH is the only Review in which I have seen any notice of Mr. Firminger's recent onslaught upon my *Church and State under the Tudors*, I may perhaps appeal to your courtesy to permit me to make a few remarks upon it.

In the first place, let me express my gratitude to your contributor, Mr. Sydney Smith, for the very complete answer which he has given to Mr. Firminger in your issue for the present month, which renders any detailed reply from me quite unnecessary. Mr. Firminger has undoubtedly hit a blot in one of my notes, inasmuch as I have therein attributed to Archbishop Whitgift a letter which is none of his, but he has thought fit to suggest two explanations of it, both of which are gratuitously discourteous. On the other hand, Mr. Sydney Smith has given almost exactly the true, and, I venture to think, the natural account of it. In using Strype's collection of original documents, I was at the time rather carefully avoiding a reference to his text, as being anxious that the originals should make their natural impression on my mind, unbiassed by the collector's own view of them. Hence the words "MSS. Whitgift" in the margin, coupled with the fact that the sentiments expressed are very much—especially in their extreme Erastianism—what might have naturally fallen from Whitgift, misled me. However, I do not profess infallibility, a blunder is a blunder, and Mr. Firminger is quite welcome to as much as he can fairly make out of it—but, let him remember that, as Mr. Sydney Smith has conclusively shown, he has himself fallen into a precisely similar blunder in his treatment of the Travers incident. Nothing in this criticism of Mr. Firminger

compels me even to give up Whitgift as a link in my chain of evidence, for I see no proof whatever that Whitgift ever held any but a purely official and Erastian view of Episcopacy. On the other hand, I might include in my chain a very much more important person, viz., Parker, who, in a well known and important official letter to Calvin, remarks that he derives the English Episcopate "not from Pope Gregory, who sent over Augustine the monk, but from Joseph of Arimathea." With the above exception—which after all does not come to much—Mr. Firminger's criticisms of my chain of evidence are, I venture to think, singularly ineffective. His suggestion that Bishop Cosin habitually and egregiously blundered in regard to matters with which he was personally familiar and actively concerned, is simply fatuous, and Bishop Morton's evidence he gets over by interpreting it in "a non-natural sense"—a mode of dealing to which we are accustomed from many of Mr. Firminger's party when treating of the Thirty-nine Articles, but which we would rather not see extended to other documents.

Mr. Firminger, in fact, habitually contradicts and occasionally misinterprets both my facts and arguments, but entirely fails to answer them.

And now, Sir, let me ask you, in conclusion, to permit me to point out another error into which I have fallen in the same note, for the discovery of which I am not indebted to Mr. Firminger, nor, so far as I know, to any other of my critics. On page 301 I have referred to Peter du Moulin the younger as having been admitted Rector of Adisham and Staple after the ejection of Charles Nicholls in 1662, and remarked that it appeared to be a case of the admission of a foreign Presbyterian on the ejection of an English one as such. I find, however, a passage in Hacket's *Life of Archbishop Williams*,¹ which states that he "sent for Dr. Peter the younger out of France, and ordained him a deacon to make him capable of his Patronage." The whole matter requires further investigation, and as it belongs naturally to the second part of the Reformation period, on which I am now engaged, I hope to contribute something further to its elucidation. The passage just quoted leaves several questions to be answered: Was Dr. Peter ever ordained priest? if so, when and by whom? If he was only a deacon, was he any more in strict law capable of patronage than he was before? It may be noticed further that Bishop Williams'

¹ Vol. ii. p. 33.

biographer (Bishop Hacket) here says that Williams did the exact thing which Morton refused to do at the request of Antonio de Dominis. Thus the case fails as an instance of the presentation of a Presbyterian since the Act of Uniformity of Charles II., though so far not absolutely, and I am glad to be able to disclaim it at once, at least till it can be conclusively determined.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

GILBERT W. CHILD.

Oxford, April 16.

Reviews.

I.—OUTLINES OF THE LAW AS TO THE CUSTODY OF CHILDREN.¹

THIS is the third edition of a little book which supplies a want that has been long and widely felt. All classes of Catholics are gradually becoming aware of the extent to which, through various causes, a multitude of children who, by every law, ought to be brought up in the knowledge and practice of the faith of Rome, are turned into the world devoid of all religion, or with minds imbued with prejudices against the truth. The effect of this loss, this leakage, as it is expressively called, is seen in the doubt widely felt in the best-informed quarters, whether any increase is going on in the actual number of Catholics in England; in other respects there are plain symptoms of improvement in our position, and a foundation is being laid for better things hereafter; but districts might be named where there seems to be an actual loss of numbers, and the increase is nowhere such as would correspond to the natural growth of families and to the steady influx of converts.

These facts cannot but cause great grief to all Catholics worthy of the name to whom they become known, and all would wish to do something to stop the leak, if they saw the possibility of effectual action. Manifold as are the claims upon the liberality of the faithful, they are always ready to support any scheme for the rescue of children that comes to them recommended by authority; and the poorest will often show their Christian charity by undertaking the care of orphans whose desolate condition has come under their notice; but the task

¹ *Outlines of the Law as to the Custody of Children*, with Chapters on the Law relating to Children in Workhouses and Reformatory and Industrial Schools. By William Cassell Maude, B.C.L., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, and Dudley William Beresford Leathley, Solicitor. With Preface by His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. London: Burns and Oates, Limited. Price One Shilling.

of saving our little ones is so gigantic that a sense of helplessness and despair is apt to paralyze all individual action. The perusal of the book before us will show that the work is not quite as difficult as some may suppose.

Most Englishmen see reason to abhor the very name of going to law ; their personal experience, or what they hear from their neighbours, induces them to think that the issue of a lawsuit is all uncertain except that there will be a bill of costs to pay. Whatever truth there may be in this view in other matters, Messrs. Maude and Leathley prove that in many cases where the custody and religious education of children is concerned, it is quite possible for any intelligent person to obtain reasonable assurance as to what will be the result of an application to the law, and what steps must be taken when such an application is resolved on ; and notice that there is an intention, based on good grounds, to take proceedings will often secure the desired result without notable expense. The authors deal with the various points that arise in connection with their subject in perfectly clear language, using no expression which they do not explain, and they have added an ample Index, to guide the reader to the place where he will find the discussion of any matter on which he desires information. Copious references are added to the Acts of Parliament and decisions of the courts on which the statements of the texts are founded, and where necessary we have the actual words of the statutes and judgments.

Any reader of the book will be able to judge how far it is worth while to apply to a solicitor in reference to any case that comes before him where the faith of a child is tampered with, either in a public institution or in a private family ; and the authors, knowing how much expense and delay arise when an applicant fails to supply the requisite information, have printed a list of questions, the answers to which should be ascertained and put in writing as the first step in any matter. There will be a still greater saving of trouble if to each answer is appended the name of some person who is able to prove on oath the accuracy of the statement. The authors repeatedly insist on the importance of prompt action in these cases ; in some instances a needless delay of even a few days may lead to the loss of a child.

Further, we are glad to read the testimony borne by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster to the

fairness of the law : it is well to quote the weighty words used by His Eminence in the Preface :

Of the fairness of the law respecting the custody of children we have no reason to complain. But we do wish and we earnestly urge our clergy and laity to acquire a fuller knowledge of its provisions, and of the unbiassed and high-minded manner in which it is administered by Her Majesty's Judges, without showing the slightest preference for the Protestant over the Catholic religion.

This testimony, in which the Bishop of Shrewsbury joins, and the truth of which the learning of the authors enables them to confirm, may surprise some readers who have noticed in how large a proportion of the decided cases the decision has been adverse to the Catholic party. The reason appears to be that Catholics will sometimes fight cases which are hopeless in point of law, for the desperate chance of winning in spite of expectation, or at least for the satisfaction of knowing that they have used every possible measure to save their children from ruin. In the words used by Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, in one of the many stages of the well-known Gossage case, the court "is not, I trust, irreligious, but it is certainly non-religious;" or, as the authors put it, the court gives no preference to one form of Christianity over another. If the case arose, it would be curious to see how far this impartiality extended ; whether, for instance, it would be applied to ensure a Hindoo training ; but at least within the pale of the Christian profession, the theory is that the father has the right and duty to direct the religious training of his child, and any contract by which he purports to bind himself not to perform this duty is void. In the absence of proof to the contrary, it will be presumed that he regards his own religion as that in which he judges it well for his child to be educated ; but in no case will he be allowed to use his rights arbitrarily to the manifest detriment of the child, as, for example, by sudden changes from the religion which, having been taught, has taken some hold in favour of another which the father has come to prefer ; and the same rule is applied to guardians of all sorts after the father's death.

We are glad to note what seems to be a new phrase used by Mr. Justice Chitty, who giving judgment in the case of *In re White*, speaks of "what may be termed the *religious rights* of the boy." This recognition should be remembered.

The authors have been diligent in consulting the latest authorities on their subject, and they have printed an Act which

passed no later than the Session of Parliament which ended just before their book appeared. On page 16 we note a case which it is hard to understand, because we are left in doubt whether the petitioner sought judicial separation or dissolution of marriage; also, we should have been glad to see a distinct statement as to how a father can enforce his right to the custody of his child against the child himself. The *habeas corpus* avails against any who harbour the child, but we are not told how the father is to proceed against his boy, who has absconded, and is leading an independent life. It is one of the misfortunes of our age that these cases are becoming more and more frequent among the poorer classes, and we should like to have been told what can be done. Would an application to a magistrate set the police in motion?

2.—THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND THE SEE OF PETER.¹

We have received advance sheets of an important book by Father Luke Rivington, to be published almost immediately. The title, *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter*, challenges comparison with Mr. Puller's *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, published only last year, and now so popular with Anglicans. Father Rivington had, we believe, projected and in part written his book before Mr. Puller's work appeared, his intention being to lay before English readers a fuller treatment than they have hitherto possessed of those passages in Church history which illustrate primitive belief concerning the position of the Pope in the Church. But as Mr. Puller travels over the same ground, or at least over much of it, Father Rivington has taken care to consider his arguments carefully; and it is difficult to see how any capable reader can resist the conclusion that Mr. Puller's contentions break down at all points. Indeed, we are compelled to rise to the yet wider conclusion that Anglican writers generally, even writers of Dr. Bright's standing, have not dealt fairly with the facts of primitive Christianity.

We shall hope to devote an article to this new book in THE MONTH for June. At present all we can do is to call attention to its appearance and give some indication of its subject-

¹ *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter.* By the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A. With an Introduction by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.

matter. The period examined extends from the Pontificate of St. Clement to the close of the Council of Chalcedon. Among the subjects treated we may mention, as being of special interest, the Clementine literature, the Cyprianic doctrine on Unity, the Sardican Canons, the Meletian Schism, the Rescript of Gratian, the Apiarian Trouble, and the first four Œcumenical Councils. Anglicans allege that the arrival in Rome of the pseudo-Clementine literature was what first recommended to the Romans the idea of a Roman Primacy derived from St. Peter. Father Rivington shows that such an allegation is inconsistent with chronology, and also that the Clementine documents are inexplicable unless we presuppose an already existing and deep-rooted acknowledgment of St. Peter's Roman Episcopate. Anglicans argue that according to St. Cyprian, the office of St. Peter in preserving the unity of the Church is to be sought, not in any primacy of jurisdiction over the other Apostles, but in the mere fact of his election to the Apostolate having preceded that of the rest in order of time. This, says Father Rivington, after showing that certain expressions, undoubtedly obscure, of St. Cyprian do not necessarily bear this construction, is really to impute to the Saint a most absurd contention; as if he supposed our Lord to say to His Church: "St. Peter, a single man, was consecrated earlier in time than the rest. Think of this, and it will always remind you that the Church ought to be one." The Canons usually known as the Sardican were cited by Pope Zōsimus in the case of Apiarius as Nicene. Anglicans on this (*more suo*) accuse Zosimus of fraud. That of course is in no supposition a tenable charge, but Father Rivington, with a qualified acceptance of Vincenzi's theory, inclines to the belief that the Canons were really Nicene, and eliminated from the extant codes by Eastern fraud. The arguments for this may perhaps not be absolutely conclusive, but it is not easy to upset them. Mr. Puller lays great stress on the fact, as he takes it to be, that Meletius died out of communion with the Holy See, and hence deduces that such communion was not considered the necessary condition for a reputation of sanctity. Father Rivington enters minutely into the history of the Meletian Schism, and makes it clear that, although the ecclesiastical status of Meletius was, or had been, somewhat equivocal—a thing not so inexcusable in the general confusion wrought by Arianism in the East—it is most incorrect to say that the Saint died out of com-

munion with St. Damasus. Meletius himself certainly laid the greatest stress on such communion. Father Rivington carries us with him throughout, but he does this particularly in his very effective account of the Council of Chalcedon. The usual custom of theological writers on both sides has been to discuss isolated phrases in the Canons and Acta of the Council, with too little attention to the light thrown on their meaning by the connected history of its origin and proceedings. Such a connected history Father Rivington gives, and thus lets us see how unquestioning was the acknowledgment of St. Leo's claims by all parties in the Council.

Cardinal Vaughan has expressed his sanction of this new book, not only by giving it his *Imprimatur*, but also by writing for it an Introduction, of which the subject is the importance of such a treatise as Father Rivington's for those who would enter the Catholic Church through the gateway of a rightly grounded conviction. Doctrines purporting to belong to the Christian revelation are to be accepted or rejected, not because they approve or disapprove themselves to the private study of the individual, but because they are or are not recommended to us by the authority of a Divine Teacher. It is as the appointed organ of such a Teacher that the Papacy comes before us, and the important, one may say the only important, question for an inquirer is whether the Popes can validly claim to be this organ. Moreover, in the evidence for this point we must distinguish between positive proofs of the position and difficulties against it. Every position has its difficulties, and if some of them are insoluble, it does not on that account need to be rejected, as long as its underlying proofs are sound.

Our thanks are due to Father Rivington for the labour spent over this valuable work, and we hope he may be rewarded by a large sale. It ought certainly to find a place in the shelves of every theological library.

3.—IRISH IDEAS.¹

As we gather from the Introduction, the author's purpose in presenting this collection of addresses to the British public is to put them in touch with the aspirations and ideals of his compatriots. The opening discourse, entitled, "The Irish

¹ *Irish Ideas*. By William O'Brien, M.P. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.

National Idea," claims special attention, as herein Mr. O'Brien, with the perfervid eloquence of his race, impaired somewhat, though it be, by a redundancy of rhetorical ornament, shows that the present demand for autonomy is no mere hankering after material betterment, but that it derives its inspiration and strength from the perennial hope rooted in the heart of the nation, which has survived the baffled efforts and crushing failures of the past. In reply to the hackneyed taunt that this is but an impracticable day-dream, mere flimsy sentiment, "let the dead bury their dead," and Ireland merge her individuality and destinies in the "great Empire" to which she is united, he replies—and who will gainsay him?—that races and nations, no less than individuals, "live not on bread alone." Referring to the records of a not long bygone time, he tells how in the darkest gloom of its Helotism the Celtic race has ever been buoyed up by hopes and ideals quickened by the dim memories of its pristine glories. With a covert side-glance at the fast-dwindling population of the "sister isle," now, in good sooth, "a little nation," he shows by the witness of history that small States, as long as they were left to themselves, have ever proved the main factors in the world's progress. His faulty, because too sweeping generalization, lessens the cogency of his argument. He surely needs not to be reminded that the Macedonian Empire fell to pieces at the death of its founder, but that its *disjecta membra* spread the Greek language and culture throughout the East, that the Greeks subjugated their conquerors, who were made to do homage to the peerless excellences of Hellenic genius.

The brief sketch of early Irish civilization which immediately follows, may as well be taken conjointly with the later address on "Ireland's age of Gold." Barring certain legendary details, the main tradition of this civilization may not be reasonably doubted, attested as it is by the objects we still possess, by the vast stores of Gaelic thought and poetry, the preservation of which in Ireland, considering the wanton Vandalism of the past, falls not far short of the miraculous.

We have dwelt with pleasure on the author's eloquent and practical pleading in arrest of the decay of the mother-tongue of the Gael, the oldest *living* language of the widespread Aryan family. The threatened extinction of the native language involves the forfeiture of the goodly inheritance of an imaginative literature, in itself the expression of former enthusiasms

and a stimulus to higher levels of thought and action. Apart from the poetry, the as yet accessible fragments of the Brehon laws, the traditional customs depicted in the Romances witness to a high standard of honourable life, in that they set forth ancient examples of manly striving, courtesy, and of high-souled heroism. But while agreeing thus far with Mr. O'Brien, we take the liberty to observe that it is misleading rhetoric to tell "the Cork Young Ireland Society" that their forefathers "enjoyed the equality of a modern republic." Of the slaves it may, of course, be said that they were aliens seized in the frequent forays on the neighbouring coasts, or the superfluous offspring of Saxon churls; but what of the *fuidirs*, whose *status* was little removed from prædial servitude, of the base or bond tenants kept under by crushing exactions? Of the land, a portion only was held in common by the tribe settled upon it. And unless our annalists have antedated certain conflicts, the voice of festive song, "the noise of a multitude keeping holiday," the chant of ascetic choirs, were but too often drowned in the din of sanguinary contests between rival dynasts. Whatever the subject-matter of a lecture or public address, such reaction against the despotism of facts supersedes history by legend. While sympathizing with the author's enthusiastic forecast of the prosperity in store for his country, when left free to shape her destinies, we cannot but regret his omission to take into account the ominous fact of the emigration which, year by year, since the fifties at least, has been draining the land of its manhood, and for reasons which need not be mentioned here, bids fair to continue!

Of the address, "On the lost opportunities of the Irish Gentry," we need say only that during their long lease of all but autocratic power, they might have effaced from the popular mind the memories of their inauguration and origin. But it is easy to be wise after the event, and our author seems to be unable to make allowance for the difficulties inherent in an inherited position. We pass by Mr. O'Brien's effusive acknowledgments of the enforced leisure which fell to his lot, *consule Balfour*. Under the heading, "A Gem of Irish Misgovernment," a passage in the recent Chronicle of Clare Island, discloses a scene of helpless misery aggravated by ruthless oppression. But without presuming to question Mr. O'Brien's veracity, we would remind him of the good old Gaelic proverb, *Is maith sgeul go d-tig an dara sgeul* (One story is good till another

is told), there may be something to be said on the other side.

And so we close a book, which cannot but interest us; yet we cannot do so without deep regret that its author should fail to see, that, under whatever guise, questions of morality are always referable to the Church, and that we can never be wrong in trusting her solutions of them.

4.—TWO AMERICAN VERSE-WRITERS.¹

The subtle influence which, floating in the air, affects the taste of a whole generation, making its art as different from that of another as its dress, is well illustrated by Mr. Piatt's Idyls. He has formed himself on many models, but on one alone with success. From Tennyson, the poet of the age, he has learnt to draw pictures in verses, which exhibit many of the characteristics of the master by whom they are inspired; though, we need scarcely add, of that master not in his most inspired mood. The following description of a pioneer's settlement in the far West may serve as an example.²

Meanwhile the years that made these woody vales
An eager commonwealth of crowding men
Passed one by one, and everything was changed;
And he whose limbs were like the hickory's, when
He came with life's wrought vigor here, was changed:
He heard the voice that tells men they are old.
Yet not the less he moved his usual rounds,
Walked his old paths: nor idle, sweated still
With scythe or sickle in the hay or wheat;
Followed his plow, when, in the April sun,
The blackbird chattered after, and the crow
Far-off looked anxious for the new-dropped corn;
And gave the winter hours their services
With sheep abroad on slopes that slanting south,
Breathed off the snow and showed a warming green,
With cattle penned at home, or bounding flail:
Thus—not forgetting social offices
Throughout all seasons, (gaining so the love
That went acknowledged in his common name.)—

¹ *Idyls and Lyrics of the Ohio Valley.* By John James Piatt. *Little New World Idyls.* By the same. *An Enchanted Castle, and other Poems: Pictures, Portraits, and People, in Ireland.* By Sarah Piatt. London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.

² We are sorry to find in a volume printed at the Edinburgh University Press, such Americanisms as "vigor."

He like the servant in the parable,
Doing his duty, waited for his Lord.

The not inconsiderable skill here exhibited appears the more remarkable when we turn elsewhere. Pope in his day exercised an influence assuredly not less than Tennyson's, and a multitude of writers caught the trick of imitation with as much fidelity as is exhibited above. But Pope's day, though a long one, is over, and when Mr. Piatt tries to handle his lyre, not only does he manifestly fail to realize the spirit of the rhythm he employs, but runs at times into plain doggerel.

He thus describes the first formation of a settlement like that spoken of in the other piece :

They came, and in the panther-startled shade
The deep foundations of a State were laid.
The axe, in stalwart hands, with steadfast stroke,
The savage echoes of the forest woke,
And one by one, breaking the world-old spell,
The hardy trees, long-crashing, with thunder fell.
The log-house rose, within the solitude,
And civilized the tenants of the wood.
It was not long before the shadow'd mold
Open'd to take the sunshine's gift of gold ;
In the dark furrow dropp'd the trusted seed,
And the first harvest bless'd the sower's need.

Not more felicitous is an attempt which challenges memories of Burns ; and here, as in some other instances, it is not very easy to gather what the writer means to convey.

The bard has sung, *The man's the gold* ;—
'T may be : who, passing, knows it ?
The rank is but the guinea-stamp,
To all the world that shows it.
The gold, though naught within the mine
But yellow dust, when minted
Your sovereign rules in mall and mart—
For value goes imprinted.

From these and other like specimens it would appear that the influence of a great contemporary poet can enable an imitator to invest his verses with a kind of merit to which, apart from that influence, he can make no approach.

Mrs. Piatt's literary genius has, we are assured, on the authority of an English literary journal, been honoured by a hundred pens, her feminine insight and fortunate tact in thought and phrase giving her verses their unique and incommunicable charm. Qualities so delicate must evidently elude

description, and we are content to give specimens, leaving our readers to appraise them for themselves.

IN PRIMROSE TIME.

The magpies fly in pairs (an evil omen
It were to see but one);
The snakes—but here, though since St. Patrick, no man
Has seen them in the sun.
The white lamb thinks the black lamb is his brother,
And half as good as he;
The rival car-men all love one another,
And jest right cheerily;
The compliments among the milk-men savour
Of pale gold blossoming;
And everybody wears the lovely favour¹
Of our sweet Lady Spring.
And though the ribbons in a bright procession
Go towards the chapel's chime,—
Good priest, there be but few sins for confession,
In Primrose time.

From the following effusion, which has been marked for special laudation, it would appear that the muse of Columbia, discarding the effete traditions of her sisters of Helicon, regards nature as furnishing material on which may be woven the trade-mark of the Stars and Stripes.

A WORD WITH A SKYLARK.

If this be all, for which I've listened long,
Oh, spirit of the dew!
You did not sing to Shelley such a song,
As Shelly² sung to you.
Yet with this ruined Old World for a nest,
Worm-eaten through and through,—
This waste of grave-dust stamped with crown and crest,—
What better could you do?
Ah me! but when the world and I were young,
There was an apple tree,
There was a voice came in the dawn and sung
The buds awake—ah me!
Oh, lark of Europe, downward fluttering near,
Like some spent leaf at best,
You'd never sing again if you could hear
My Blue-Bird of the West.

At the same time, one is irrepressibly reminded [of the opinion of another American writer, and an expert in bird music, Mr. John Burroughs,³ on the subject of this same

¹ In this volume English spelling is used. ² *Sic.*

³ *Winter Sunshine*, pp. 204—206. (English Edition.)

luckless lark of Europe and his song: "The more I heard it the better I liked it, and I would gladly have given any of my songsters at home for a bird that could shower down such notes, even in autumn, . . . that song above you almost as unceasing as the light of a star." Still more remarkable is it that when enumerating the songsters at home which come nearest to the Lark, he makes no mention at all of the Blue-Bird of the West.

Literary Record.

I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

THESE Notes of Retreats and Instructions,¹ delivered, most of them, during the last year of Father Morris's life, when he had arrived at the fulness of his spiritual growth and experience, will not fail to be of deep interest to all who are aware of the mastery he had acquired of the science of the saints. Though the compilation of the work has under the circumstances been done remarkably well, we see at a glance that, as a whole, it is regrettably inadequate (to use the words of the Introduction) "to convey to those who have not come under his personal influence an idea of the force and earnestness of the speaker." Indeed it would seem that points of meditation read afterwards, without the surroundings which, at the time they were given, so much facilitated our rising to the thoughts suggested, must almost of necessity give an even worse idea of their delivery, than that which a report of a speech or sermon usually presents of the speaker or preacher respectively.

It is not uninteresting to compare this volume of Father Morris's retreats with the similar volume of Archbishop Porter's, to which, by the way, this is intended to be a companion. The pithy sense of the latter shows perhaps at "the report stage," if we may use the phrase, better than the eloquent piety of the former. Yet we find throughout the book before us such passages of sustained devotion, and such vivid presentations of our Lord's Life, as will surely never fail to make this volume much read and highly valued.

¹ *Notes of Spiritual Retreats and Instructions*, given by the late Rev. John Morris, S.J. 353 pp. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company, 1894.

The name of Dr. Joyce¹ on the title-page of a book is an infallible voucher for a trustworthy and interesting treatment of its subject-matter. The brevity promised in the title of this volume will be found throughout to be compatible with fulness and accuracy of statement. The story of Ireland is here told without legendary embellishments, but simply, apart from any striving after effect, with a strict adherence to ascertained facts, which are, after all, the only true material for enduring history. Hence his vivid narrative of the wrongs and woes of his native land maintains throughout the calm of judicial impartiality. Effacing, so to speak, his own personality, eschewing exaggeration and bitterness, he allows the events and personages of the five epochs into which his history is divided to tell their own tale. Sifting from the mass of legendary details, wherewith they are overlaid, the grains of historic truth, he gives a full and erudite account of the native language and literature, of the folk-lore, the ancient jurisprudence, of land tenure, of the arts, and ecclesiastical antiquities, in a style at once popular and attractive. The task undertaken by the gifted author is beset with no small difficulty, as is shown by the failures and shortcomings of similar works. Besides affording opportune aid to a satisfactory solution of the Irish Question, it entitles Dr. Joyce to a high rank among the historians of his country.

Elizabeth Gonzaga² has been raised by the brilliant pen of Castiglione in his *Castegiano* to an exalted place among the women of Italy. She was the daughter of Frederick, Marquess of Mantua, and of Margaret of Bavaria, and was born in 1471. By her marriage with Guid' Ubaldo di Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, she became the centre of his learned and brilliant Court. There, too, she met her sister-in-law, Isabella d'Este, who became the wife of Elizabeth's brother, Francis. The description of Elizabeth's marriage-feast, from a contemporary letter to a sister of the bride, is exceedingly curious. The story is a powerful one, as it falls in the evil days of Cæsar Borgia, who drove the Duke of Urbino from his states. The death of Alexander VI. opened to him again the road to his capital, but he died without an heir in 1508, and was succeeded by Francesco Maria della Ronere, nephew of Julius II, the child of Guid' Ubaldo's sister, and who had been adopted by

¹ *A Concise History of Ireland from the earliest times till 1837.* By P. W. Joyce, M.A., LL.D., &c. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1893.

² *Mantova e Urbino. Isabella d'Este ed Elisabeth Gonzaga nelle relazioni famigliari e nelle vicende politiche.* Alex. Luzio e Rodolfo. Roma, 1893.

him. Francesco married Leonora Gonzaga. But the new Duke had to make way, under Leo X., for that Pope's nephew, Lorenzo, whose exquisite statue figures on the Medici tomb at San Lorenzo. Francesco recovered his dukedom again on the death of Leo, and Elizabeth lived an honoured widowhood in his Court, sharing his exiles and his glories. The work is written with great care, and is based on documentary evidence. But it is written with a strong anti-Papal bias, which colours all the facts, and completely ignores the Catholic influences which, in spite of the irreligion and immorality of the times, is always to be traced, the silver lining of the cloud.

The *Explication des demandes du Pater*¹ is but a portion of the spiritual writings of the humble porter of Majorca, published by Father Nonell, in the original Spanish, at the time of that Saint's canonization. The translator has already brought out in French the Autobiography of St. Alonso, under the title, *Vie admirable de Saint Alphonse Rodriguez*, d'après ses mémoires. This has been embodied in the Life by Father Goldie in the Quarterly Series, and still more integrally in the *Vida de S. Alonso*, by Father Nonell. Written late in life, when the memory was failing, it required to be corrected by the contemporary Life which was composed during the Saint's lifetime. It has many repetitions and several historical mistakes, but it is full of a beautiful fragrance of humility and high spirituality. This little treatise is quite within the reach of ordinary Christians, and is no doubt the result of the Saint's meditations and lights in prayer.

A magnificent reproduction of the Vatican Dante,² illuminated by Giulio Clovio, is rendered all the more valuable by the addition of the artist's rough sketches which he submitted to the Duke of Urbino before he carried them out. Bradley's recent *Life of Clovio*³ dates these miniatures at about 1542. The artist canon was *facile princeps* in the Renaissance school of illumination. The frontispiece is in the full bloom of that period. But many of the other illustrations bear strong imprint of much earlier styles, and it seems certain that the work was done at different periods. Some of the sketches have a very modern

¹ *Explication des demandes du Pater*. Par St. Alphonse Rodriguez, S.J., traduit de l'Espagnol par un Père de la même Compagnie. Lille, 1893.

² *Il Paradiso Dantesco nei quadri miniati e nei bozzetti di Giulio Clovio*, pubblicati sugli originali della Biblioteca Vaticana da Guiseppe Cozza-Luzi, vice Bibliotecario di S. R. C., Rome, 1894.

³ *Life and Works of George Giulio Clovio*. By John W. Bradley. London, 1891.

look, and might be the work of the last century. The letter-press and phototypes are of the highest character.

Whatever ignorance of art there may have been in the New World of the United States, it is rapidly disappearing among the educated classes of the great Republic. Paris has been a long time the centre of the American artists' ambition. Her wonderful schools have become their ideal. But Italy is studied by them with love and reverence. If Mr. Berenson is an American, his essay¹ on Venetian Painters proves the deep art feeling of our cousins across the sea. His view of the Renaissance, the influence of which on art is undoubted, appears true. None, however, but a Catholic can realize how deeply faith reacted on the minds and hearts of those who were apparently led captive by the new life and new learning. This accounts for the religious feeling to be found in the works of a Titian and Tintoretto. Compare them to the so-called religious paintings of to-day, and the contrast is most evident.

On the greatest festivals, each year, the church or chapel, to speak more strictly, of the Knights of Malta at Valetta, is hung with splendid Low Country tapestry² from the designs of Rubens, the *gioja* or official present of the Bali Perellos y Roccaful, on his being chosen Grand Master in 1697. They were the products of various Flemish looms wrought under the direction of Cavaliere Preti, the artist of the immense fresco which covers the vault of the chapel. Sir Ferdinand Inglott gives a full and harmonized account of these works of art.

A Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry,³ which to a great extent breaks new ground, is in some sort the supplement to *A Treatise of Heraldry, British and Foreign*, published in 1892. In a large work of 580 pages it is impossible to avoid occasional errors, but the craze of continuity is perhaps answerable for the slurring over the fact that the arms of York for at least a century before the Reformation, were the same as they are to-day, with this serious difference that Peter's tiara, and not Henry's crown, was *in chief proper*. The author (p. 499) falls foul of Cardinal Vaughan's coat of arms which he lately assumed, and wonders how it could have been approved by a member of the Herald's

¹ *The Venetian Painters of the Renaissance*. By Bernhard Berenson. New York, 1894.

² *The Flemish Tapestries of the Church of the Grand Masters*. By Sir Ferdinand Inglott, K.C.M.G. Malta, 1893.

³ *A Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry*. By John Woodward, LL.D., Rector of St. Mary's Church, Montrose. Edinburgh, 1894.

College, as it "*appears* to the ordinary observer to be a direct annexation of the arms of the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury." The numerous coloured and uncoloured engravings, the Appendices and the copious Index, add exceedingly to the value of the work, which is full of interesting reading even for those who are not experts in the mysteries of heraldry.

This volume¹ of the International Chalcographical Society is occupied with the etchings of the artist, known as the "Master of the Amsterdam Cabinet," from the fact that eighty of his works are kept in the Royal Print-room of that city. That he flourished in the last quarter of the fifteenth century is all that seems to be known for certain about him. The subjects of the etchings are in great part religious. They are rough and coarse both in conception and execution.

The richly-illustrated work² by Von R. Muther gives the history of art in civilized countries during this century. Japan even appears among the European States, while America is largely represented. It can hardly be said to be a pleasant survey. The ascendancy of matter over mind, and the servitude of a noble art to base pleasure, is strikingly brought out. The author gives many of the *fin du siècle* schools who sacrifice beauty to a straining after originality. And one's eyes rest with satisfaction on the peace and beauty and purity of the Christian art of Overbeck and his companions after the violence and effort of more popular painters. The photogravures cannot give the perfect *technique* which is the chief excellence of modern art.

The wonderful Palatine Chapel of Palermo,³ described by M. Pavlovsky, is perhaps especially remarkable for its wooden roof, with its decorations of the middle of the twelfth century. The writer of this essay discusses the question as to whether the Mussulmans were absolutely prohibited from representing living beings, and decides both from the text of the Kurán and from the evidence of history that there was no such positive prohibition. The entire paintings, if not that of Arab artists, show plainest evidence of Eastern influence. Eastern legends figure there, as do the classical arabesques of the Renaissance, amidst Christian subjects. In his conclusion, the author gives as his opinion that the whole is the work of Arabian artists.

¹ *International Chalcographical Society*. Berlin, 1893—1894.

² *Geschichte der Malerei im XIX. Jahrhundert*. Von Richard Muther. 3 vols. Munich, 1893.

³ *Decoration des plafonds de la Chapelle Palatine*. By M. Pavlovsky.

A work on the elaborate inventories of the Hotel and of the Château of Rambouillet,¹ is preceded by an excellent sketch of the d'Angennes, to whom these houses belonged. The inventories enable one to form a complete picture of the interior of a French nobleman's town and country residence in the seventeenth century.

Mr. Hewison has certainly reason to be proud of his "labour of love," in describing the Isle of Bute in the Olden Time,² and proves that those who are most busy do the most. We cannot find room for more than the briefest notice of a work of great merit. This volume deals with prehistoric and Celtic times, and the Saint, whose ruined church still stands—a beautiful Early English transition work—Blaan, the mild, has a long chapter dedicated to his memory. The letterpress, the printing, and the illustrations are all excellent.

A capital handbook of the interesting county of Somerset³ is profusely illustrated with reproductions of pen-and-ink sketches and several etchings. The type is excellent, though the size of the book suits it more for a table than for a tourist's knapsack. A county that contains Wells and Glastonbury and Dunster Castle cannot fail to be worthy an artist's and archæologist's record; but Mr. Barrett's book opens out numberless places of the deepest interest. Muchnelney Abbey, Montacute House, Brympton Manor, are a few among the minor glories of the county.

Mr. Hutchinson's work⁴ is one of considerable research, and is consequently of much value to any who may desire to know the local history of the Archdeaconry. But, as with so many Anglicans, his ignorance of Catholic matters is marvellous. Mr. Hutchinson at page 3 talks of the "Augustinian Order of St. Benedict, or Black Canons," "who were all subject to the Bishop of the diocese, and consisted of canons who were English priests"! He then goes on to speak of the Cistercians: "These were of foreign Order (*sic*), and subject only to the Pope, . . . those who were priests had often been ordained abroad, and had never had any connection with the diocesans." At page 35 he quotes Leland, that at Newcastle (under Lyne)

¹ *Inventaires de l'Hôtel de Rambouillet à Paris en 1652.* Publication de la Société Archéologique de Rambouillet. Tours, 1894.

² *The Isle of Bute in the Olden Time.* By James King Hewison, M.A., F.S.A. (Scotland), Minister of Rothesay. Vol. I. 1893.

³ *Somersetshire: Highways, Byways, and Waterways.* By C. R. B. Barrett. London, 1894.

⁴ *The Archdeaconry of Stoke-on-Trent.* By the Rev. S. W. Hutchinson, M.A. London, 1893.

there were Black Friars. "Gasquet," he adds, "puts them down as Dominicans"! He admits that the Cistercians were useful in their day: "Though nestled down in fertile valleys, they possessed lands on the cold bleak moors, which by constant painful toil they brought under cultivation," &c. But did not they make the valley where they nestled down smile, and was it not probably marshy and poor when first given to them? The author's remarks about celibacy in the middle age, which, he says, came in "with the simultaneous spread of Monasticism and Romanism," are certainly not of a character to raise our ideas of his power of dealing with facts. Ten cases quoted from another work (p. 7), the context of these quotations not being given, and which range over a period of time from 1222 to 1331—they apparently all refer to Staffordshire—are hardly convincing. They speak of the children and wives of *clerici*, and in two or three cases of the sons of rectors. But a *clericus* was not necessarily in Holy Orders, nor was it impossible for parson or rector to have been married before he took Orders, or possibly to have been a father without having been married. But such a case—and it might have been during a more than a century's record—does not establish that "rectors were able to retain their benefices, even though they were married men." (p. 6.) An amusing proof of continuity, which the author thinks "important," is that the rectors were before the Reformation "presented by *lay* patrons, instituted by the Bishop, &c., exactly in the same way as after the Reformation." As the work does not profess to be other than "historical notes," it is perhaps unfair to expect more; but the bulk of the book is but a list of the monasteries, churches, &c., with the names of the abbots or the incumbents, and their patrons. The religious census of the Uttoxeter Deanery in 1676 (p. 157) is interesting, giving a total of Anglicans, 19,122; Papists (*sic*), 289; Nonconformists, 421. There is also a curious inventory of church stuff, *temp.* Edward VI.

The Continental opera-house of to-day is the temple of the modern State. On it are lavished the art and wealth which in other days were devoted to our cathedrals and churches. That of Vienna, if not so graceful or so splendid as its rival of Paris, shows that no money nor skill have been spared to make it a sumptuous fane of music and society. The Imperial State rooms are especially noteworthy. The whole of this work¹ is illustrated

¹ *Das K. K. Hofoperntheater in Wien*, erbunt von E. Van der Nüll und A. von Sicardsburg. Vienna, 1893.

by photographic reproductions. The paintings and statuary, which are of decidedly Teutonic cast, are freer than Gallic works from objectionable and voluptuous objects.

II.—MAGAZINES.

We trust that it will not be taken as any disparagement to the writers of the three excellent articles in the *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, if we say that to the non-German reader the reviews and *Analekten* constitute the most interesting portion of the first number for 1894. Albrecht Ritschl may be a name to conjure with in the Fatherland, but that philosopher and his conceptions of the Deity have not sufficient attraction to tempt us to embark upon the eighty pages which Father Beda Rinz devotes to his second article on this subject. Father Svoboda's further elucidations of an important epoch in the history of Bohemia, the *Landtag* of Prague in 1575, and Franz Schmid's theological dissertation on Transubstantiation will also be of interest mainly to specialists. On the other hand, the miscellaneous contents of the Review are most attractive. Foremost among them we may specify Dr. Oscar Braun's translation of the letter-books of the Catholicus of Seleucia, purporting to date from the beginning of the fourth century. These letters have been found in a Syriac MS. of the Propaganda Library, copied it would seem from a very much disorganized original. There are amongst these, documents addressed by and to the Empress St. Helena, the mother of Constantine; and the whole series is full of interest. Dr. Braun promises to discuss the question of their genuineness in the next number of the *Zeitschrift*. Again we may specially commend the notice by Father Michael of Schepss' edition of the newly-recovered fragments of Priscillian, and the remarks by the same writer on Johann Schmid's dissertation on the question of St. Peter's presence in Rome. But nearly all the latter part of the number is admirable.

In this well-known serial,¹ devoted to the history, language, and arts of the Byzantine Empire, among the many valuable articles there is one, copiously illustrated, which treats incidentally, but with great fulness, more than one subject of deep interest. This occurs at p. 361.

¹ *Byzantische Zeitschrift*. Band. I. Leipzig, 1893.

